

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major:

John S. Alexander	Chester M. Lupushansky
Joe B. Crownover	Kenneth J. Smock
Dene T. Harp	Edgar D. Pitman
Eugene W. Gleason	David M. Bidwell
John E. Quay, Jr.	Harry Hunter, Jr.
Paul G. Graham	Donald R. Dempster
Edgar F. Remington	Cecil L. Champion, Jr.
John E. McVey	Ross R. Miner
Elbert F. Price	Eraine M. Patrias
Thomas L. Cobb	Joseph DiFrank, Jr.
Ted H. Collins	Kenneth J. Conklin
Gordon R. Squires	Richard J. Fellingham
Joseph W. Krewer	Walter E. Sparling
John W. Kirkland	Paul L. Hitchcock
John J. Murphy	William R. Quinn
Robert D. Slay	Joseph L. Wosser, Jr.
Richard W. Benton	Stanley G. Dunwiddie, Jr.
Harold F. Keller	Jack G. Kelly
Robert L. Parnell, Jr.	Elwin M. Jones
McDonald D. Tweed	Julian G. Bass, Jr.
Loren W. Calhoun	Daniel A. Somerville
Daniel A. Casey, Jr.	Emanuel R. Amann
William F. Harrell	Leland S. Gaug
Harvey L. Jensen	William B. Higgins
Herbert F. McCormick	Richard B. Haines
Truman Clark	George R. Pillon
Stanley E. Adams	Charles N. Sims, Jr.
Robert C. Simons	James T. Doswell II
Thomas H. Nichols, Jr.	William H. Johnson
James S. McAllister	George T. Keys
Thomas W. Clarke	Paul T. Wiedenkeller
Duane G. Lynch	Leslie W. Bays
Robert E. Paulson	Leo Gerlach
John T. Ryan	Bobby Carter
Joseph A. Nelson	Donald R. Harris, Jr.
Rocco D. Bianchi	Steve Furimsky, Jr.
Robert V. Anderson	Roy E. Oliver
William L. Hall	Jerome J. C. Beau
Charles H. Watkins, Jr.	

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

Frederick L. Farrell, Jr.	William E. Garman
James C. Gerard	Richard L. Hawley
Gerald W. Vaughan	Charles R. Kucharski, Jr.
Richard H. Marciniak	Eugene Lichtenwalter
Marvin E. Day	Edward J. Sample
Marcus D. McAnally	Edward H. Stansel
Rylen B. Rudy	David R. Stanton
Paul G. Janssen	Harold J. McMullen
Richard T. Spencer	Robert L. Zuern
Jimmie L. Dillon	Robert D. Jameson
Coyle H. Willis	Robert D. Purcell
Lawrence R. Hawkins	Joseph B. Brown, Jr.
Raymond L. Duvall, Jr.	Billy D. Conrad
William K. Hutchings	John R. Fox
Reginald G. Sauls IV	Joseph P. Mitchell, Jr.
Edison W. Miller	John S. Bugg, Jr.
Donald W. Anderson	Joseph R. Lepp
Alan B. Kimball	Cyril H. Cornwallis-Stevenson, Jr.
John W. P. Robertson	Joe E. Willis
William H. Stewart, Jr.	Thomas F. Rochford
Marque C. Debenport	William H. Keith
Leo J. LeBlanc, Jr.	Robert E. Nicholson
Laurence A. Taylor	John C. Love
William G. Brothers, Jr.	Robert E. Cook
Guy R. Campo	Franklin C. Broadwell
Ralph F. Kenyon	Donn E. Seaman
Alfred N. Drago	John A. Hennelly
James S. Thompson	James W. Dion
Louis W. Schwindt	John H. Strandquist
Michael A. Ciaburro	Morgan L. Spence
James W. Kirk	Theo F. Aschenbeck
George M. Lawrence, Jr.	Jack K. Griffith
Allan H. Robb	Charles F. Keister
Wallace H. Graham	Samuel J. Fulton

Richard Petroff for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant

in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Richard H. Esau, Jr.
William R. Gentry.
William R. Irwin.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 27, 1958:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Walter H. Hodge, of Alaska, to be United States district judge, division No. 2, district of Alaska, for the term of 4 years.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Frank Aloysius McKinley, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, for the term of 6 years.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Henry J. Cook, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky for a term of 4 years.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

John Burke Dennis, Missouri, to be United States marshal for the western district of Missouri for a term of 4 years.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 27, 1958:

POSTMASTER

Perry C. Harris to be postmaster at Brown- ing in the State of Illinois.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 27, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

John 8: 12: *Jesus said unto them, I am the light of the world; he that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.*

Most merciful and gracious God, we worship and adore Thee for Thou art the life of our lives, the light of our minds, and the love that fills our hearts.

We thank Thee for the manifestation which Thou hast made of Thyself as the strength of all that is good and the glory of all that is beautiful.

Thou art always drawing us to Thyself by the bonds of love which nothing can break, and seeking to lead us out of darkness into the blessedness of the larger and more abundant life.

Grant that daily we may be baptized with Thy Holy Spirit, giving us an awareness of Thy presence, an inflow- ing of Thy peace, and a new sense of Thy power.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yes- terday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7870. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1955, to authorize an additional \$10

million for the completion of the Inter- American Highway;

H. R. 12356. An act to amend the act en- titled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1954; and

H. R. 12377. An act to authorize the Com- missioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital improvement pro- grams and to amend provisions of law re- lating to Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Na- tion's Capital City.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6006. An act to amend certain pro- visions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and effi- ciency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10015. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1959, the suspension of du- ties on metal scrap, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the fol- lowing title:

S. 2498. An act for the relief of Matthew M. Epstein.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the com- mittee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amend- ments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10746) entitled "An act making appro- priations for the Department of the In- terior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHN- STON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of cer- tain records of the United States Gov- ernment," for the disposition of execu- tive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States num- bered 58-14.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1958

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privi- leged resolution (H. Res. 578, Rept. No. 1777), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12591) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreement un- der section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 8 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and rank- ing minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments shall be in order to said bill ex- cept amendments offered by direction of the

Committee on Ways and Means or an amendment proposing to strike out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of the bill H. R. 12676, and said amendments shall be in order any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, but such amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT APPROPRIATION ACT, 1959

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 11767, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1776)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11767) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 18, 19, and 20, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$59,044,890"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$14,195,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$20,659,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "110,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment,

as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That \$35,000,000 shall be transferred to this appropriation from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, for purchase and distribution of agricultural commodities and other foods pursuant to section 6 of the National School Lunch Act, such additional funds to be used for the general purposes of section 32"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$16,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$12,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$375,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided further, That an additional amount, not to exceed \$20,000,000, may be borrowed under the same terms and conditions to the extent that such amount is required during fiscal year 1959 under the then existing conditions for the expeditious and orderly conduct of the loan programs under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, not to exceed \$5,000,000 of which shall be available for loans under Title I and section 43 of Title IV of such Act, as amended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,968,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 8 and 17.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
C. W. VURSELL,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
LISTER HILL,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11767) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the

action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service

Amendment No. 1, research: Appropriates \$59,044,890 instead of \$58,444,890 as proposed by the House and \$59,362,390 as proposed by the Senate. It is intended by the conferees that all items earmarked in both the House and Senate reports shall be carried out by the Department during the coming fiscal year. The full amounts proposed for each project are approved with the following adjustments: \$100,000 additional above the amount earmarked by the House for rust research on cereals; a total of \$125,000 for cold-hardiness research on citrus; and a total of \$25,000 for research on "hotspot" conditions in the lower Rio Grande Valley.

Amendment No. 2, plant and animal disease and pest control: Appropriates \$47,132,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$41,732,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees are in full agreement that no funds shall be expended by the Department for eradication of the screwworm unless and until fully matched by the States in which such program is carried out.

Amendment No. 3, meat inspection: Appropriates \$17,326,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$24,326,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have agreed that the new mandatory poultry-inspection service may be located under the Agricultural Marketing Service, at the discretion of the Secretary. The conferees feel, however, that the Secretary should give attention to setting up a new combined inspection service or should take such other steps as may be necessary to prevent the creation of duplicate offices and supervisory personnel for the meat-inspection work and the poultry-inspection activity. In this connection the conferees direct that additional supervisory personnel in Washington and the field for these activities be held at an absolute minimum and that no new area or district offices be created for either service.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5, State experiment stations: Appropriate \$31,553,708 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$30,353,708 as proposed by the House.

Extension Service

Amendments Nos. 6 and 7, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico: Appropriate \$53,715,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$50,715,000 as proposed by the House.

Agricultural conservation program

Amendment No. 8: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House intend to offer a motion to recede and concur with the Senate amendment with perfecting language to require that the 1959 program remain the same as the 1957 and 1958 programs. Most States followed the language contained in last year's conference report, directing that no changes be made in the 1958 program to restrict eligibility requirements or delete cost-sharing practices included in the 1957 program. Since a few States made changes in the 1958 program despite such directive, the conferees have agreed to language in the accompanying bill which will restore any such changes and will make certain that future changes are made only upon the recommendation of the county committee concerned.

Agricultural Marketing Service

Amendment No. 9, marketing research and agricultural estimates: Appropriates \$14,195,000 instead of \$14,095,000 as proposed by the House and \$14,287,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase is provided to extend the quarterly cattle and feed reports to 13 additional States. No funds are provided

for monthly interim statistics. The conferees have received some complaints concerning the accuracy of the quarterly reports. They request that this matter be studied by the Department and reports of findings be provided to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses.

Amendment No. 10, marketing services: Appropriates \$20,659,000 instead of \$14,097,000 as proposed by the House and \$21,272,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase includes \$6,500,000 for poultry inspection, \$42,000 for extension of wholesale meat reports and market news services, as set forth in the Senate report, and \$20,000 for strengthening wool standardization and grading work.

Amendments Nos. 11 and 12, school-lunch program: Amendment No. 11 appropriates \$110 million instead of \$100 million as proposed by the House and \$125 million as proposed by the Senate. Amendment No. 12 restores House language authorizing the transfer of section 32 funds for the purchase of food for use in the school-lunch program; for this purpose the amount of \$35 million is provided instead of \$55 million as proposed by the House.

Soil Bank programs

Amendment No. 13, conservation reserve program: Appropriates \$200 million as proposed by the Senate instead of \$250 million as proposed by the House. The reduction is based on final figures indicating total sign-ups of \$71,468,000 for the 1958 program.

Amendments Nos. 14 and 15, conservation reserve program: Authorize \$16 million for administrative expenses instead of \$15 million as proposed by the House and \$17 million as proposed by the Senate, and provide \$12,750,000 for county-committee expenses instead of \$12 million as proposed by the House and \$13,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17, conservation reserve program: Reported in disagreement.

Commodity Stabilization Service

Amendment No. 18, Sugar Act program: Appropriates \$76 million as proposed by the Senate instead of \$71 million as proposed by the House.

Rural Electrification Administration

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20, loan authorizations: Authorize \$317 million for rural electrification loans as proposed by the Senate instead of \$300 million as proposed by the House; also authorize \$67,500,000 for rural telephone loans as proposed by the Senate instead of \$60 million as proposed by the House.

Farmers' Home Administration

Amendment No. 21, loan authorizations: Establishes a contingency fund of \$20 million as proposed by both Houses, with not to exceed \$5 million for farm-ownership loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the balance for farm operating loans under title II of that act.

Office of the General Counsel

Amendment No. 22, salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$2,968,000 instead of \$2,943,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,043,000 as proposed by the Senate. The additional \$25,000 is for legal work related to the new mandatory poultry-inspection work of the Department.

Commodity Credit Corporation

The conferees have considered statements contained in the reports of the two committees, particularly comments relative to cotton and other export subsidy programs. They are in full agreement that it is the responsibility of the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate to review activities of the Department of Agriculture under all existing laws for which appropriations are proposed by the executive branch

or are considered by the Congress. In carrying out this responsibility, they recognize that it is within the jurisdiction of such committees to recommend approval or disapproval of appropriations and to make comments and recommendations with regard to such programs and activities.

In connection with the comments of the House committee on the export policies of the Department, the conferees would point out that were it not for exports, American agriculture literally would smother in its own production. Sixty million acres of cropland—1 out of every 5—produce for export. The large flow of agricultural products to customers overseas not only provides additional farm income but also eases the pressure of supplies on the domestic market and strengthens prices.

In the 1956-57 marketing year the United States exported over \$1 billion of cotton, \$400 million of tobacco, \$196 million of soybeans, \$190 million of rice, \$350 million of feed grains, \$231 million of dairy products, \$46 million of poultry products, \$405 million of fats and oils, \$230 million of fruits, and \$958 million of wheat.

In the handling of Commodity Credit Corporation operations, including the export program, it is to be noted that payments to the trade for such things as storage, handling and transportation costs, including any exorbitant profits, in fact all costs or losses of the Commodity Credit, add to the costs to the Treasury and increase appropriations. Further, they are charged against the farm program, and are frequently used as arguments against farm programs, though, of course, such expenditures do not go to the farmer. These facts make it essential that the Committees on Appropriations maintain a continuing review of departmental activities to see that unnecessary expenditures are not made and unnecessary losses are not incurred due to the failure of the United States to retain its fair share of world markets.

The conferees point out that the Commodity Credit Corporation has full authority to sell farm commodities in world trade on a competitive basis and would call attention to the large increase in American exports for dollars which have occurred with the use of such authority in the past several years. The conferees take note of the fact that the Department has announced, with reference to cotton, that in the future the authority to sell competitively for dollars through normal trade channels will be maintained concurrently with a program of payment of an export subsidy in kind.

It is the opinion of the conferees that, in order to retain for the United States its fair share of world markets, all authority of law should be used to the fullest extent necessary to keep United States farm commodities offered in world trade at competitive prices. Officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation, in the interest of the Government and of the farm programs, in keeping farm commodities available in world trade at competitive prices, should make every effort to obtain the largest return for such commodities with the minimum of cost.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
C. W. VURSELL,
JOHN TABER.

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there is complete agreement, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. And that it be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 11, line 25, insert: "Provided further, That no change shall be made in such 1959 program which will have the effect, in any county, of restricting eligibility requirements or cost-sharing on practices included in the 1958 program, unless such change shall have been recommended by the county committee and approved by the State committee."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 8, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "Provided further, That no change shall be made in such 1959 program which will have the effect, in any county, of restricting eligibility requirements or cost-sharing on practices included in either the 1957 or the 1958 programs, unless such change shall have been recommended by the county committee and approved by the State committee."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 18, line 4, strike out the colon through the word "program" on line 10 and insert "Provided further, That in determining the amount of rental payments the Secretary shall give due consideration to the value of the land and the rental value thereof."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 17: Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 17, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: "Provided further, That hereafter no conservation reserve contract shall be entered into which provides for (1) payments for conservation practices in excess of the average rate for comparable practices under the agricultural conservation program, or (2) annual rental payments in excess of 20 percent of the value of the land placed under contract, such value to be determined without regard to physical improvements thereon or geographic location thereof. In determining the value of the land for this purpose, the county committee shall take into consideration the estimate of the landowner or operator as to the value of such land as well as his certificate as to the production history and productivity of such land."

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield for that purpose?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not yield at this time, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the conference report be postponed until tomorrow.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER**. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. REUSS. The point is withdrawn, Mr. Speaker.

CURRENT ECONOMIC CONDITION

Mr. Hiestand. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the **RECORD**.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. Hiestand. Mr. Speaker, much has been made of the extraordinary circumstances surrounding the current economic condition of our country. Time and again, Members of this body have, in the course of debate, made references to particular phases of our economy, and with the familiar chorus, "never before in the history of our Nation" and so forth, proclaimed this a peculiar recession.

Mr. Speaker, I quite agree, and if a note of irony is detected in my voice and statement, I assure you it is completely intentional.

It is peculiar indeed, that savings are at an all-time high, and still climbing, while we are supposedly in the ruthless grip of economic disaster.

It is peculiar, beyond comprehension, that the buying power of our people is so strong that prices are continually forced upward, while the Nation supposedly flounders in a business slump.

It is peculiar, exceedingly peculiar, that farm income is up \$2 billion from the same period last year, yet supposedly recession stalks the land.

Mr. Speaker, the peculiar aspects of this recession, some of which I have just cited, add up to only one thing. That is, this is a psychological recession. Yes; a mental recession, and though I am no psychiatrist, I say, let us get up off the couch and quit thinking recession, and we will soon discover that it was mainly a state of mind.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. O'Brien of New York. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 76]

Andersen,	Garmatz	Morrison
H. Carl	George	O'Hara, Minn.
Andrews	Granahan	Passman
Ashley	Grant	Philbin
Auchincloss	Green, Pa.	Poage
Barrett	Gregory	Powell
Bass, Tenn.	Gross	Radwan
Boggs	Gubser	Reece, Tenn.
Boland	Gwinn	Riley
Brooks, La.	Harris	Robeson, Va.
Buckley	Hays, Ohio	Saund
Byrd	Healey	Scott, N. C.
Carnahan	Hemphill	Shelley
Celler	Hillings	Sheppard
Chelf	Holt	Shuford
Christopher	Holtzman	Sieminski
Colmer	Hull	Siler
Coudert	Ikard	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	Jackson	Taylor
Dawson, Ill.	James	Thompson, La.
Dies	Jenkins	Thornberry
Diggs	Kearney	Trimble
Dollinger	Kilburn	Udall
Donohue	Kirwan	Vinson
Dowdy	Lennon	Vursell
Doyle	McCarthy	Watts
Engle	Marshall	Weir
Farbstein	Merrow	Zelenko
Fogarty	Miller, Calif.	
Forand	Morris	

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Three hundred and thirty-two Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ADMISSION OF THE STATE OF ALASKA INTO THE UNION

Mr. O'Brien of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7999) with Mr. **MILLS** in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **CHAIRMAN**. When the Committee rose on yesterday all time for general debate on the bill had expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to the provisions of this act, and upon issuance of the proclamation required by section 8 (c) of this act, the State of Alaska is hereby declared to be a State of the United States of America, is declared admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the other States in all respects whatever, and the constitution formed pursuant to the provision of the act of the Territorial legislature of Alaska entitled, "An act to provide for the holding of a constitutional convention to prepare a constitution for the State of Alaska; to submit the constitution to the people for adoption

or rejection; to prepare for the admission of Alaska as a State; to make an appropriation; and setting an effective date," approved March 19, 1955 (chap. 46, Session Laws of Alaska, 1955), and adopted by a vote of the people of Alaska in the election held on April 24, 1956, is hereby found to be republican in form and in conformity with the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and is hereby accepted, ratified, and confirmed.

Mr. Boyle. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the dean of the Illinois delegation, **THOMAS J. O'Brien**, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the **RECORD**.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE LATE CARDINAL STRITCH

Mr. Boyle. Mr. Chairman, it is with keen sadness that the Illinois delegation has learned of the death of the beloved and universally respected Samuel Cardinal Stritch, Archbishop of Chicago, who died in Rome last night at the age of 70, only 1 month and 1 day after he was appointed to the Roman Curia, the highest governing body of the church.

Samuel Cardinal Stritch was the first American-born cardinal to be so honored. He was elevated to that body when on March 1, 1958, Pope Pius XII appointed him pro-prefect of the congregation. It seems but yesterday that various Members of the House of Representatives took the floor to felicitate and wish well this great prince of the church and this truly great American on the occasion of that most singular and recent honor. Samuel Cardinal Stritch through all his years has demonstrated a talent, a love and affection for the humble and the meek and the lowly.

A brilliant student, Samuel Cardinal Stritch was ordained to the priesthood by special dispensation a year before reaching the canonical age of 24. He became a bishop at 34, an archbishop at 43, and a cardinal at 58.

Samuel Cardinal Stritch was known best for his work in the cause of world peace, united charities, and the Catholic youth movement—a group of all races and all faiths.

American liberals of all faiths considered him an outstanding liberal. Samuel Cardinal Stritch was deeply concerned about the problems of labor and was friendly to labor organizations; he condemned as morally wrong interference with Negroes seeking to use the rights they enjoy under the Constitution, and he established a policy of helping all minority groups to integrate themselves religiously, socially, and economically into the life of their city.

It is said that a kindly providence called him so abruptly to his just reward long before he had an opportunity to further demonstrate that intensity of purpose that scholarliness and that charity that made him beloved the world over.

At this time it is with considerable sadness that we point up, on the floor of

the House, the passing of a great churchman, a great American, and a truly great humanitarian as he goes to his much-merited reward, and we only hope that a kindly providence will visit upon his successor the same talent, the same respect, and the same love of little people that the great Samuel Cardinal Stritch, Archbishop of Chicago, demonstrated so thoroughly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I read with grief of the death of Cardinal Stritch, a great churchman and a great American. His spiritual leadership was not confined to his influence on communicants of the Catholic Church, but to all persons of all creeds of a religious mind. It was only several weeks ago when Mrs. McCormack and I were in Chicago when I was addressing the Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus that we spent a very pleasant hour with Cardinal Stritch, an hour that will always be one of our treasured memories. Cardinal Stritch's leadership in the spiritual field and in the field of government as an American citizen was outstanding. He possessed a universal mind, and his thoughts and his utterances appealed to all persons of deep faith and of a religious mind. Countless millions of persons of all faiths and of all creeds will feel a real sorrow in the passing of this great churchman and this great American.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I join with the gentleman from Illinois in expressing our grief at the death of Cardinal Stritch. As the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] so well said, regardless of one's faith or one's political creed, everyone in Cook County and in Illinois was very much mindful of the great works of charity and the great works of religion which were so close to Cardinal Stritch's heart. When he came to Chicago from Milwaukee, yes, even before he came to Milwaukee, we all realized the great charitable works undertaken by Cardinal Stritch. Those of the Catholic religion as well as those of all other religions will ever remember the great work he has done for his church and his country.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate my remarks with those of the gentleman from Illinois as well as the distinguished majority leader. As one who was born and educated in the city of Chicago, I, too, recall when our beloved cardinal came to the great city of Chicago. His work was outstanding. He was a recognized leader not only as a leader of the Catholic Church, but his leadership was felt in all civic activities in our area. He was a great builder of churches, a great builder of schools, and his influence was

far reaching. He particularly had a great love for the retarded children and the exceptional children. We in Chicago, as well as people in all parts of the United States of America not only feel great sorrow at the departure of this great leader, but we shall miss him.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, Cardinal Stritch was a distinguished and beloved former citizen and resident of the city of Milwaukee. His loss will be deeply felt.

Samuel Alphonsus Stritch became Archbishop of Milwaukee in 1930. He was only 43, one of the youngest men ever to receive such an appointment. In his 10 years as Archbishop of Milwaukee, Cardinal Stritch made inestimable contributions to the welfare and betterment of the entire community.

His energetic work in charity, in educational expansion, in parish expansion will not be forgotten. Cardinal Stritch held the respect and friendship of Milwaukeeans of all faiths.

His concern for the suffering and the needy extended worldwide. He fought always against racial discrimination. He was a devoted American. His belief in democracy was firm and strong.

The christian world has lost a great and dedicated spiritual leader. Nowhere is the sadness at the death of Cardinal Stritch more deeply felt than in Milwaukee, where so many of his good works were accomplished.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join with the Illinois delegation in paying tribute to the memory of Samuel Cardinal Stritch who passed away yesterday in Rome, Italy.

The people of the Calumet region of Indiana, which adjoins Chicago, mourn the passing of this great religious leader and humanitarian. The cardinal's outstanding accomplishments during a long life of religious service are familiar to people of all denominations throughout the Middle West.

That he would become a man of great intellectual attainment was demonstrated in his very early years as a boy in high school and college through hard work and sacrifice during his younger years. As a priest, his abilities were soon recognized by his church superiors and gradually his responsibilities increased until he reached one of the highest pinnacles of office and position in the Catholic Church. Cardinal Stritch was an acquaintance and friend of Pope Pius XII since his school days in the Seminary in Rome. During all these years, the great ability and work of Cardinal Stritch in his religious life was so outstanding that a few months ago His Holiness appointed the cardinal to the Roman Curia as pro-prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, the church's missionary agency. This is the highest recog-

nition ever bestowed upon an American prelate.

The people of Illinois, Indiana, and other Middle West States will long mourn the memory of this leader of the church whose great religious work and charities have benefited hundreds of thousands during his long service in the work of God.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the news of the untimely and unfortunate passing of Samuel Cardinal Stritch reached me late last night. It was the unwelcome news which I had hoped might not take place at this critical time in world history when we are so much in need of great leaders.

Through the last several weeks after learning of Samuel Cardinal Stritch's grave condition, like so many people all over the world, I read each bulletin with anxiety as the great churchman's life hung by a thread.

This great cleric and great American was a brilliant man and had a brilliant life. Truly he was a living exhibit of the proposition, "As a man is, so he acts." He was a man of energy and intensity of purpose. Ten years after his birth in Nashville, Tenn., on August 17, 1887, he graduated from grammar school. By the time he was 16 he had a bachelor of arts degree.

Eighteen years later he was named bishop of Toledo, Ohio, the youngest member of Roman hierarchy in the United States. When he was only 43 he became archbishop of Milwaukee, one of the youngest men ever to receive such an appointment.

Ten years later he was made archbishop of Chicago, the largest archdiocese in the United States with more than 2 million communicants. It was in that role we first truly appreciated his great capacity for community good and untiring work.

Of his continued achievements, in 1945 at the age of 58 he was named a cardinal. As such he became titular pastor of a church in Rome—St. Agnes Outside the Walls.

He flew to Rome for the ceremonies and saw again the fields where he had played baseball at the North American College in Rome some 40 years earlier.

Samuel Cardinal Stritch was the first American-born cardinal of the Roman Curia.

So it is with a deep sense of loss that we mark his passing. In death we continue to recall his simplicity as signalized in remarks uttered in his inaugural address when he said, "In my poor person you see the shepherd whom Pope Pius has sent."

Now the Great Shepherd has called Samuel Cardinal Stritch home.

Although his passing is a distinct loss to Chicago, to Illinois, to the United States and the entire world, may his inspiration, love, and charity live on.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join my colleagues from Illinois and the country in paying tribute to the outstanding prelate of the Middle West, Samuel Cardinal Stritch, who passed away this morning in Rome, a few short weeks after he was accorded his greatest honor by the Roman Catholic Church,

that of pro prefect of the Vatican's Congregation for Propagation of the Faith.

Cardinal Stritch was born in Nashville, Tenn., on August 27, 1887. After studying in Cincinnati and Rome, he was ordained a priest at the age of 22. A special dispensation was needed since priests usually are not ordained until the age of 24. Ten years after his ordination he became bishop of Toledo, Ohio, the youngest member of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the United States. In 1930 he was named archbishop of Milwaukee and 10 years later became archbishop of Chicago. In December 1945 he was elevated to the College of Cardinals.

Samuel Cardinal Stritch was a prince of the church who retained the manner of a simple parish priest. The son of an Irish immigrant who died when the cardinal was a boy, Samuel Stritch rose in church councils through extraordinary mental and spiritual gifts which were displayed from his boyhood. He was enormously popular in Chicago and was highly respected for his administrative energy and revered for his good works. Through his leadership rapid strides were made in the construction of new schools, churches, and colleges.

Since 1944 the Sheil School of Social Studies—Chicago—has annually awarded the Pope Leo XIII Medal in recognition of outstanding work in the field of Catholic social education. In 1949 this distinct honor was awarded to Samuel Cardinal Stritch.

He was known as "the cardinal of charity." His concern for the suffering and the needy extended beyond the diocese in Chicago, which was the largest in the United States. In 1946 he became chairman of the bishop's war emergency and relief committee, which sent tons of food and clothing to war victims.

The slight, silver-haired cardinal took a lively, liberal interest in world affairs. In 1938 he lashed out at the Nazis for savagery and barbarism. He lent his voice and influence to bolstering the United Nations in its early days.

The city, the county, the State, and the Nation mourn the death of a great citizen and a great American.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Chairman, Samuel Cardinal Stritch died as a true servant of God, whose entire life was spent in the service of mankind. He passed his earthly way giving religious nurture to the souls of men. With brilliant fervor he met his many tasks contributing to the spiritual welfare and peace of mind of millions of Americans. His work among the old and infirm resulted in the building of homes and institutions for their care. His charitable nature sustained the many programs that he sponsored for the needy and the poor. His contribution to the medical profession remains a monument to his memory in the establishment and maintenance of a college of medicine through his efforts. He loved humankind and was venerated with godly respect by men of all creeds.

He was a pillar of American decency and as a churchman supported the censorship of films and publications that exerted a satanic influence upon the minds of the youth of our country. He sponsored cultural and social seminars

to bring out in the open the problems of racial misunderstanding. He was a guardian to the new immigrant populations and fought for their acceptance in their communities. He was honored by the Catholic Church as a prince of its holy family—by the Catholics of America and the world as a scholarly religionist and by the unfortunates in every walk of life as the true servant of the great Saviour. God walks with him today as Christianity grieves and men bow their heads in prayers of love and veneration.

His spirit moves on but his works remain to remind us that the destiny of this holy man was to lead the sacred way to everlasting life and instill broken men with a new hope to better live their lives for a new chance in the heavenly world of the hereafter. He loved us—we ask God's blessings. The citizens of Chicago are proud of his memory and the goodness of God for sending him to us.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it was Easter Sunday morning. Holy Name Cathedral in Chicago was filled, some worshipers standing in the aisles. It was the last public mass of Samuel Cardinal Stritch before the departure of His Eminence for Rome and the assumption of his new duties as pro prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith which directs the Roman Catholic mission work.

The tone of the mass was joyous as befitted the Easter season. Honor through their cardinal had come to Chicago. Nevertheless the sentiment in every heart in that great cathedral was of sorrow not exultation. There may have been a sense of foreboding.

The cardinal, brilliant though his administration had been, had won the heart of Chicago as "the bishop of charity," "the bishop of the poor." His leadership had been directed toward making Chicago a city in which spiritual values should take precedence over the material. Everyone in the congregation filled with reverence and affection for their spiritual leader, sensed the fact of approaching separation. Rejoicing that the great talents of their archbishop were to be extended to a worldwide field, their hearts were heavy in contemplation of their personal loss. There were tears in many eyes when his eminence began his farewell sermon.

Wherever you teach people the dignity of man and our blessed Saviour, it helps instill in them a desire for freedom, equality and dignity. * * * If all Americans live our democracy and shoulder its responsibility, we shall become a great force in the world.

That was the message of Samuel Cardinal Stritch to the people of Chicago and through them to America.

Mr. Chairman, those were the words of Samuel Cardinal Stritch in his farewell sermon when celebrating his last public mass in the Holy Name Cathedral. It was as though he had seen through the purpose of his Master soon to call him home and were leaving for his own parishioners, for Chicago, his country and all the world the counsel of his faith to guide them.

Chicago, with pride and joy, underlaid with the sorrow of pending separation, relinquished their cardinal to the broader

service of the church in the missionary field. Death has not defeated that purpose, for he who was a spiritual force in a great city has become a symbol for our times and for the ages of that which motivated him, love of mankind and faith in God. His life among us, his words and his deeds, have left us a spiritual legacy and in those words in his farewell sermon on Easter Sunday at Holy Name Cathedral a blueprint for the world we seek, a world to be gained when "All Americans live our democracy and shoulder its responsibilities" in respect of the dignity of man and faith in God.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, every American, regardless of his faith, race, or creed, is saddened by the death of Samuel Cardinal Stritch. We citizens of Chicago particularly will feel his departure. Since 1939 he was our chief prelate.

Probably no other American enjoyed so rapid a rise in the hierarchy of the Catholic Church. He graduated from high school at the age of 14, and 2 years later finished St. Gregory's Preparatory School. He attended the North American College in Rome.

In 1921 he was named bishop of Toledo, in 1930 he became archbishop of Milwaukee and in 1939 moved to Chicago. In 1946 he was 1 of 4 Americans created a cardinal by his close friend, Pope Pius XII.

Cardinal Stritch was a man of devotion wherever the welfare of his people was concerned. He was intensely interested in labor and the improvement of the laboring man's lot. He stood squarely and firmly for equal treatment of all Americans. Wherever he served, he lifted the moral tone of the community. Under his leadership the Chicago archdiocese had a phenomenal growth. His administrative capacity won him further recognition when the Pontiff appointed Cardinal Stritch the pro prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. This congregation is one of the most important in the church's organization with supervision over 25,000 missionary priests, 10,000 missionary lay brothers, and 60,000 missionary nuns. Its jurisdiction covers areas in 5 continents. It was in the discharge of this important task that Cardinal Stritch suffered his fatal illness.

In paying this small tribute I know I am expressing the sorrow of millions who knew him, who revered him, and who are richer for his having walked among us.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, holding a crucifix before his eyes, Samuel Cardinal Stritch of Chicago died last night in Rome. His Eminence had left his post as archbishop of Chicago just 1 month ago to become the only American-born prelate to serve on the governing curia of the Roman Catholic Church.

Beloved in Chicago and throughout the archdiocese, Cardinal Stritch's departure for Rome was marked by a civic observance. Through many years he had contributed greatly to the spiritual and material well-being of the community. So great was his contribution that his work was recognized by all segments of the community.

Illinoisans, and in particular Chicagoans, were saddened even in their elation at the great honor which came to Cardinal Stritch upon his selection by Pope Pius XII to serve on the Roman curia central government of the church. They gave him up to the higher call with reluctance and the archbishop accepted the call in the same manner. He did not want to leave his flock but he could not fail to respond to the assignment from the Holy Father as pro-prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith.

The Nation, the State of Illinois, and the city of Chicago mourn the death of this great churchman, and Americans in all walks of life are saddened at his passing. Known as the Cardinal of Charity, he had a saying: "As long as 2 pennies are ours, 1 of them belongs to the poor."

Cardinal Stritch was a devoted American. It was 13 years ago that he was elevated to the College of Cardinals. At that time his message to his people in the United States was that America "must be a beacon light of democracy to all men and peoples." Leaving for Rome to begin his new work he extolled democracy to newspapermen and warned against a destruction of spiritual values and elevation of the material. As he sailed away from New York Harbor his parting words were: "We will not fight materialistic philosophy with a mere materialistic democracy."

The prayers of all Americans join together today in memorial to Samuel Cardinal Stritch whose Christian influence will be felt through many generations yet to come.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, when Samuel Cardinal Stritch became bishop of Toledo, Ohio, at the age of 34, he was the youngest member of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the United States.

His death yesterday in Rome, at the age of 70, came less than 2 months after he became the first American-born Cardinal of the Roman Curia, central governing body of the Church.

What kind of a man was this whose spiritual leadership encompassed half a century?

Those who knew him best will remember him as a gentle, kindly, scholarly man, yet one with firm, clear convictions. How typical was his greeting when he became head of the great archdiocese in Chicago in 1940. "In my poor person," he said, "you see the shepherd whom Pope Pius has sent."

Humble in the sight of God, Cardinal Stritch was outspoken when the occasion demanded it, as exemplified by his recent warning against the destruction of spiritual values in favor of material ones. "We will not fight materialistic philosophy with a mere materialistic democracy," he said.

Cardinal Stritch was one of the outstanding religious leaders in our country. His death will be mourned by all Americans and especially by the people of Illinois.

Mr. DELLAY. Mr. Chairman, the world is saddened today by the passing of Cardinal Stritch and his death is being mourned by all Christendom.

Spiritual leaders, such as he, have helped to bring about a spiritual reawakening, and a resurgence and re-awowed belief in God. In these serious times, we need and demand a consciousness of our spiritual well-being and our soul. Dedication to and belief in God is our own salvation, but also is one of the best fortresses against communism and Communist teachings which threaten the world and our democratic way of life.

Cardinal Stritch of Chicago, U. S. A., will be remembered as the 15th Cardinal of the Roman Curia, the official resident in Rome who aided Pope Pius XII in the government of the church, but to peoples of all faiths he will be long remembered for his fight for world peace, the underprivileged, his devotion and interest in the welfare of young people, and his avid concern for the problems of labor. His life of 70 years is a testimonial to his love of mankind and his God.

As he goes to meet his Maker, he brings with him a long list of outstanding and commendable marks of achievement, the greatest of which was his appointment by Pope Pius XII on March 1, 1958, pro-prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. He was the first American ever appointed to this high position in the Vatican.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, it was with a profound feeling of sadness that I learned of the passing of Samuel Cardinal Stritch in Rome. With his death, the world lost a powerful and significant force for good.

To think of him only as a religious leader is to single out but one of his many wonderful personal qualities. He was a spiritual leader of the highest idealism and the greatest intellectual capacity, a man with a gift of warm friendship, of sympathetic understanding, of broad vision, and of profound wisdom. He was gentle and kind in all of his endeavors, even when conducting his most determined efforts to achieve his goals.

Cardinal Stritch had a passion for justice for all men without regard to their religion, their race, or their place of origin. He frequently left the quiet isolation of his religious study to participate in the turmoil of the community's human relationships, and because of his actual experience with people, his inspiring messages were based on solid fact. He used the pulpit to fight for the right as he saw the right.

In my conversations with Cardinal Stritch, I was impressed by his fervent desire to make government responsible and responsive to the needs of the people and he provided active leadership in thought and action to create a genuine spiritual renaissance of the democratic faith. He condemned ostentatiousness and materialism, urging adherence to the true values upon which democracy and the human spirit lives. He demanded maturity and responsibility in citizens and in public servants alike.

People of all faiths admired the courage and composure with which Cardinal Stritch faced his recent physical afflictions. People of all faiths admired his devotion to humanity. People of all faiths will mourn his loss.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise to pay tribute to a great American and a great church leader, Samuel Cardinal Stritch. With his passing, America and all of the God-fearing world, has lost one of its glowing champions for Christian action. As in the past he had spoken out against the tyrannous and savage Nazi movement; he served in more recent times as a shining beacon from this citadel of democracy to the religious world.

I, as a Protestant layman, pay humble tribute to this man, recently religious leader to the Catholics of the world and a religious inspiration to us all.

Cardinal Stritch was known to the people of Ohio long before he was known to the people of the world. When serving as the bishop of Toledo he was the youngest member of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the United States, and the people of Ohio remember him for his outstanding efforts to help the less fortunate citizens of that area. As he was known to America as a pioneer in works of welfare, he was known to the members of his diocese as a constant friend to all of those who were in need of help.

In being the first American to hold so exalted position in the Roman Catholic Church, Cardinal Stritch was again evidencing his outstanding ability to pioneer for God and man in whatever field of service he was called.

He has now gone to the final reward for those who give outstanding service to God and their fellow man. Mr. Chairman, with the loss of Cardinal Stritch, America has lost one of her outstanding citizens; the people of the world have lost one of their most compassionate friends, and the entire religious world has lost one of its great leaders. But, the work he has done, and the impression he has left upon the minds, and hearts, and souls of men everywhere will make the memory of Cardinal Stritch live on in the years to come as a lasting memorial to this great pillar of faith.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the earth has lost one of its noblest inhabitants with the passing of Samuel Cardinal Stritch. The life and works of this devoted man speak eloquently for themselves.

His prodigious work for the underprivileged earned him the unofficial titles of "Bishop of the Poor" and "Bishop of Charity." His tireless energy, his humility, his brilliance, and his strong patriotic views reached the point of legend. He was, in particular, an untiring foe of communism, nazism, and all forms of tyranny over man.

That this man should be struck down at the pinnacle of a life filled with service and sacrifice is to be especially mourned. But all may take comfort in the fact that he died as he lived, working for his God and his fellow men.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER: Page 2, line 10, strike the period, insert a semicolon and add the following: "Provided, however, That the provisions of this section shall

have no force or effect until said constitution shall have been duly amended to deny power to the legislative and/or executive branches of the State government to legalize gambling in any form."

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, what I propose is to require that the constitution of the proposed State of Alaska, prior to the time that it is admitted to statehood, be so amended as to take away any power either of the legislative or the executive branch of the proposed State government, to legalize gambling in any form. Many of the Members were not here the other day when I discussed the matter of the economy of Alaska. There are only some 40,000 people in private employment in this whole vast area, equaling one-fifth of continental United States during the warm weather, and only 20,000 during the cold weather. That fact makes this an area of vast economic danger and potential destitution.

One of our continental United States, with a very small population, has had to turn to the device of legalized gambling in order to support itself. That State is next to my own State of California. If such a device should be turned to by the Territory, I want the Members to think of it in relation to the 50,000 United States servicemen who are stationed in the area, many of them young boys under the age of 21. Remember what happened in such places as Phenix City where gambling ran riot in areas adjacent to posts, even in continental United States, let alone up in Alaska where there are but few other diversions for the servicemen during their off-duty hours.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is our responsibility to pass such a protection for those servicemen, and it is also our duty to pass such a protection for all the citizens of Alaska, particularly those younger citizens whom we, as Americans, I am sure, would not want to see grow up under conditions breeding delinquency, which conceivably could happen.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am in accord with the sentiments of the gentleman's proposed amendment, but I should like to ask if there has ever been a definition of gambling. What is gambling? Is bingo gambling? Is betting on the horseraces or is a little pitch gambling? Some of these boys play a little poker.

Mr. HOSMER. I decline to yield further. I will answer the gentleman this way. The gentleman is possibly a few years older than I am and I think he has been around. He probably knows the definition of gambling as well as I do.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. In order to get clear what the gentleman does have in mind, does he include parimutuel betting, that is carried on in his State within a few miles of military installations in his State?

Mr. HOSMER. I would refer the gentleman to the library adjacent to the

floor of the House, which is known as the Law Library of the House of Representatives. There are plenty of books in there that define gambling, for either the gentleman or anybody else who may be in doubt about the term.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Has any similar provision ever been placed in the constitution of any other State?

Mr. HOSMER. I think that would be irrelevant and immaterial to this discussion if it had or had not. We are talking about the year 1958 and we are talking about the geographical location of that land which has to be protected by a great permanent body of young men in uniform, who have been taken away from their homes and family guidance, and for whom we as legislators have a responsibility to insure that they perform their duty in as clean an environment as possible. This is the way to do it, because if you do not do it here you are going to have legalized gambling in that Territory, and all that goes with it, because they cannot afford to live without that kind of revenue.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Would the gentleman possibly suggest that if it is necessary for us to write into Federal law and into the provisions for the admission of this Territory such a provision, in other words, legislate for them in this fashion, perhaps they are not ready for statehood?

Mr. HOSMER. I think that has been the burden of the argument by many of us, but if the Congress is going to persist in this action it should be done in as clean a fashion as possible.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we had anticipated a number of proposed amendments to this bill but I am rather startled to discover that the first amendment offered comes very definitely under the heading of frivolous. This amendment was not offered at any time in the committee by the gentleman who is now so concerned about the servicemen who might be led into a bingo game in Alaska.

The gentleman knows that his State has gambling. New York has gambling, many other States have gambling, parimutuel betting and bingo, among other things, and they are bringing in millions of dollars into their treasuries. In New York alone I think our revenue from gambling was around \$50 million. Now we are about to say to a new State, "You must not do any of these things," assuming, of course, that the new State plans to do so.

I do not know why the gentleman did not go all the way and prohibit the legalization of the sale of alcoholic beverages, and speak out firmly against sin of every kind.

The gentleman said that the servicemen in Alaska have no diversion. Well,

we were in Alaska and discovered that there was just as much diversion for the servicemen there as anywhere else. Alaska is not a place of polar bears or Eskimos entirely. It is not the Alaska of Jack London or Robert W. Service. I think this amendment is offered entirely for frivolous purposes. I cannot believe that the House of Representatives would ever create a new State anywhere and start laying down provisions which do not apply to any other State by Federal mandate.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. I want to assure the gentleman it is not offered in a frivolous vein whatsoever, and that during my period of service I probably covered as much ground in the Territory of Alaska as anybody in this Chamber except the Delegate from Alaska. I am familiar with the Territory and its geography. I know its people well. I seriously offer this amendment because of that prior knowledge of the land, its people, and its conditions, and its economic poverty.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. The gentleman is as well acquainted with Alaska as he stated, but it is too late for the gentleman to protect himself now from these iniquitous gambling games that might flourish in Alaska. I am sure the gentleman, who is a man of the world, knows that any serviceman anywhere can find some way to gamble, if he wants to, and I think he also will agree that there is just as much gambling among servicemen whether or not there is a parimutuel track or a legalized bingo game somewhere in the neighborhood.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Realizing the gentleman has been to Alaska a number of times and studied this and probably gone into their constitution with them, that is the constitution they adopted, can you tell me whether or not this gambling matter was discussed by the people of Alaska at the time they were discussing statehood with you or at the time they were considering the drafting of their constitution?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. No; it was not; and I might say to the gentleman further, having a slight trace of sporting blood in my makeup, I rather zealously looked here and there to see if, perhaps, there was some little way of indulging in a game of chance, and I found none.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. You mean in Alaska?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. So I do not believe if the people of Alaska become full citizens of their State that they will suddenly plunge into gambling. Why should they, when the gentleman himself argued here that we were making this enormous giveaway and that they were going to pick up gold at every street corner—they are not going to need this support from gambling, if the gentleman is right in his other argument.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If the gentleman will yield further, then the Alaska people would have no objection

to the amendment of the gentleman from California because they are against gambling; is that not right?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Oh, yes, they would object to putting it in their statehood bill, if you put in this frivolous proposal. This is a stall just the same as having a referendum first is a stall. It is only to delay this another 42 years and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Would the gentleman be in favor of forbidding gambling if we do not delay the statehood bill?

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs I have been very much interested in statehood for Alaska for the past 4 years that I have had an opportunity to serve in this House. We anticipated that there would be amendments offered here—some in good faith and some possibly with the idea maybe of hurting the legislation. I would like to say with reference to this particular amendment which has been proposed, and as my colleague the gentleman from California indicates, was offered in good faith and I accept it as being in good faith, but I, for one, am for States rights because I think this is in the first place definitely an infringement on the rights of the State and I do not think that the balance of the States of the Union would have appreciated having written into their admission legislation matters which would have precluded them from carrying on things of this kind. I, too, would like to say on behalf of our neighboring State of Nevada, although I think they certainly receive substantial revenue from the gambling that goes on in that State, but at the same time that happens to be their business and I do not think we should in any sense criticize them. I feel sure that the State of Nevada would be going forward and would be progressing, in my own opinion, possibly better without gambling than they have been with it. But that is a matter that is up to them, just as it should be up to the State of Alaska. Having spent some time in Alaska, I have a great deal of respect and regard for the people who live up there, for the men and women that I had an opportunity to meet and talk with. I am sure there are those up there who would engage in a game of chance just as there are a great many in the States that engage in games of chance from time to time. This represents another way to hurt this particular legislation that we have before us.

I take the floor at this time to plead with you to give us an opportunity to present the best bill that we possibly can. Then if you are opposed to statehood, cast your vote in opposition, as I am sure you shall. On the other hand, if you are for statehood, we ask for an opportunity to perfect to the best of our ability the finest type of admission legislation. Then on its merits let it stand.

I realize in all probability we may be faced with many kinds of amendments that will be offered. Frankly, it is simply a stall, and I think in view of the great amount of business that confronts

this House I might say, in connection with what the gentleman from Virginia had to say the other day, we have a great many things that we should be doing. Let us proceed in a fair and equitable way to bring about the best legislation that we can. Then let us vote it up or down strictly on the merits of the case.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Does the gentleman think we have got a pretty good bill?

Mr. SISK. I think that the bill as a whole is a very good piece of legislation. I might say to the gentleman there are some things that could be done perhaps to improve it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. You suggest that we vote on it and get through with it?

Mr. SISK. Of course I supported it in committee and I will support it now. On the other hand, I agree it could possibly be perfected.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I want to find some area of agreement with the gentleman whom I respect very much. I am willing to go to bat on it just as it is. I do not want any amendments.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman. As I say, there are some amendments that will be offered that I believe will improve the legislation. Possibly there are some other amendments that will be offered by other Members that could improve the legislation. We hope it will be improved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that games of chance are played in Alaska, but the chances taken are principally in the search for gold and other minerals, and opportunities for advancement in a frontier land. As a matter of fact, the Territorial Legislature has enacted some very severe prohibitions against gambling. They are enforced to the best of the ability of the law-enforcement officers throughout the Territory. I do not doubt that once in a while a game of cards may be played here or there for money, but there is no legalized gambling of any kind. But whether there is or not, I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] that this amendment would be writing into this bill, first, a provision which would give Alaska less than equality with the other States; and, secondly, which would merely serve to delay the arrival of statehood. I want to say that we should not consider seriously a proposition of this kind. We should inquire into the main features of the bill and vote them up or down and then vote the bill up, as I hope the Committee and the House will.

But I cannot speak for the future as to what the State of Alaska might do regarding legalized gambling. I have my own views relating to that, and they are that we will not need revenue from that

source to maintain ourselves; we have enough resources of a more substantial kind, and those resources will enable the State government to live and live well, and the people in the State likewise. In any case that is a decision which the citizens of the State themselves have every right to make as do the residents of every other State in this Union. It is not right that the Congress should seek to impose restrictions on Alaska in this respect or in any other that are greater than those applied to other States of the Union.

I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to enter into a discussion of the subject of whether or not I believe in gambling; I think public sentiment speaks pretty well on that subject. The thing that does disturb me greatly is the gambling we are doing here in this House, and have been doing and are about to gamble, I think, beyond the realm of reason when we begin to gamble on upsetting and shaking around these 48 United States.

I do not think it is enough for you or me—and many of you I know have and certainly I have laid my life on the altar for the defense of this country—I do not think it is enough to say only that to be a good American; I think you must add to it the statement, "Not only was I willing to make that sacrifice, but I am willing to stand up and defend it and protect it as long as I live."

For the life of me, I cannot see the sound basic reasons that would support the action that is being sought. I do not propose to be one who is intolerant of others' ideas; I do not question their motives on the floor of the House; I do not make this statement applying to anyone except myself. To me, personally, it points right straight at the patriotism I possess for my country. I do not think we could ever make Alaska one of our 48 or 49 States as we recognize States; I simply do not think it would make any contribution towards the strength of our existing 48 States.

If Alaska needs additional self-governing power, then I say give it to her. I want the people up there to be free people, I want them to be freedom-loving people, I want them to develop the way they want to develop; but to me, to attempt to erase the 3,000 miles of Canadian territory between the borders of the United States and Alaska and then call it a United States of America, 49 States, just does not add up in my way of thinking.

Certainly, I am not unkind to anyone in Alaska. I do not think less of them; I just love the United States of America more than any other nation on the face of this earth. And, I think it has been demonstrated on the floor of this House that there are very serious misgivings about this matter. I think everyone will agree with me that this House is approximately divided 50-50 right now on this subject, and here we are considering maybe making a mistake by 1 vote or 2 votes. No, I do not think the at-

mosphere is right or the time ready to make that change.

Now, somebody raised the question of the political significance. Oh, they will have two additional Democratic Senators, they say, and an additional Member of the House. I would not care whether they were Democrats, Republicans, or what they may be. We do not need them bad enough to take them in this way. I do not believe there is anyone on this floor that is absolutely sure about the situation. So, when we speak of gambling, let us not gamble here. This is no place to gamble, and I say to you seriously it is a gamble when this House is just about 50-50 divided right now. Somebody is wrong, and about 50 percent of the 435 Members of this House are wrong, because that is the way it stands. Until the atmosphere is a little clearer, until the justification can be made clear, I say I will not be one to take it, with the ability and the standing and the union of the 48 States as this great country exists today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOSMER) there were—ayes 33, noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER: Page 2, line 10, strike the period, insert a semicolon and add the following: "Provided, however, That the President shall not issue the proclamation required by section 8 (c) until by decennial census or otherwise the Bureau of the Census shall have determined that not less than 250,000 United States citizens permanently reside in the Territory of Alaska."

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would delay the creation of the State until a minimum of 250,000 United States citizens are permanent residents of the Territory of Alaska.

Now, this amendment does not hold it up. It does not say "decennial census," because they obviously will not have that many there by the 1960 census. It does not make them wait until 1970, when they have the next decennial census. The Bureau of the Census can come in any time between and take a census of the Territory. If they find 250,000 United States citizens permanently residing there, then the condition of statehood is met, if the bill is passed, and then Alaska becomes a State. Mr. Chairman, why should I ask the House to attach such an amendment as this to the bill? I think perhaps I can best explain it by reading the minority report, which I wrote, and which will be found in the report on this bill. It goes like this:

According to 1956 United States census population estimates, the population of Alaska is 161,000 of which approximately 141,000 are adults. This does not include 50,000 transitory military personnel in the Territory; they have no bearing on the statehood issue.

The population of the Territory is far less than that of any of the 435 Congressional Districts in the existing 48 States. It totals less people than the capacities of many college football stadiums.

Under the circumstances, there simply does not exist in the Territory of Alaska the basic minimum number of people to warrant or support statehood status.

Although some States had no more population when admitted than Alaska today, the situations are not comparable due to reasons of geography, economic potentialities, and time in history.

How many people are 161,000? Imagine a football stadium on the day of the big game filled with people. There would be just about that number—perhaps a few more. This report of mine may be a little in error; but, if you left the children home, you could get every adult person in the Territory of Alaska into one of our major football stadiums. Last Friday I mentioned to this House that there are 40,000 people gainfully employed in private employment in that Territory during the summertime, 20,000 in the wintertime. Just visualize what that means. Visualize this stadium; if you take an area from the goalpost to the 50-yard line, and take out those people, that would be just about 40,000 people.

Mr. Chairman, do you think that those 40,000 people—that is, in the summertime; 20,000 in the winter—are ever going to be able to support some \$30 million a year of statehood expenses, without coming into an economic crisis? Why, of course not.

That is why I have to oppose this bill. I have made mention before of these riots and troubles in various areas around the world and related them directly to the economic situation of poverty and distress in those areas, which made them breeding grounds for trouble. Do we wish to create a State which in this sense will be a breeding ground for trouble in these critical times of the world? Why, of course not.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the ladies and gentlemen of this Congress to withhold statehood long enough so that we will have at least a quarter of a million people up there so that they may have a reasonable possibility, at least an outside chance, of being able to support the expenses of the creation of this new State government which would have to govern an area equal to the area of all the United States from Maine to Florida and inland through the Appalachians. That is the expense that those 40,000 people would have to bear.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the passage of my amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention of the Committee to the fact that had the gentleman's amendment prevailed at the time other States were coming into the Union, there would be 16 States that would not have been admitted to the Union, including the gentleman's own State of California. When California came into the Union, on September 9, 1850, there were 82,597 people in California. Had such an amendment been in force then California would not have come in, Arkansas, California, Arizona, and Illinois. Indiana had only 63,897 people when she came in as a State of the Union. Illinois had less than 35,000

when admitted in 1818. Yes, the great State of Ohio when admitted in 1830 had 60,000 people. As I recall the debate on Ohio and other States the record will show that some of the Members of Congress at the time of their admission tried to have an amendment adopted similar to the one offered by the gentleman from California, to the effect that there were too few people in the proposed State, too many rattlesnakes, too many sand dunes, the land was worthless. "We don't want Ohio as a State because it is worthless land. No one wants to live there." The very same argument made against Ohio and other States when they were coming in as States could be made against Alaska at this time.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. The gentleman does not in any way, shape, or form wish to contend that the States to which he has referred are any fraction of the area of one-fifth of the area of the United States of America as presently constituted on this continent, does he? Does not that make a very distinct difference, the population density and the number of other factors growing from that fact? Are not the statistics the gentleman is using inapplicable to this case, although they might have been applicable to the admission of some other States?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. When California came into the Union it was about 100 times the size of Delaware. I have one county in my district larger than Delaware and Rhode Island put together, in square miles. The gentleman's State was nearly a hundred times larger than Delaware, and the gentleman from Delaware in 1850 made the very argument the gentleman is making, that California was too large, it ought not to be brought into the Union because it was too far removed from Washington, too far away, the land was worthless. California came in with 92,597 people.

The gentleman from California said, "Why do I ask the House to adopt this amendment?" I do not think he would vote for the bill if his amendment were adopted. If I am wrong, I yield to the gentleman for a correction.

Mr. HOSMER. Will the gentleman yield for any other purpose?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No, I am just trying to find out if the gentleman will support the bill if the amendment is adopted. I am quite sure he would not support it.

So I say to you, there were 16 States that came into the Union with less than 250,000 population. I just hope this amendment is not adopted. Sure, Alaska is one-fifth the size of the United States. When Texas came into the Union it retained the right to divide itself into 5 States, and it might well want to do it some day. California is a tremendously large State, the largest of all when it came into the Union. That was one of the biggest objections to California's coming in as a State, that it had only 92,000 people at the time.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman stated just a little while ago that the argument used against the admission of California to the Union was that a lot of the land was worthless. Has that ever been disproved?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. They are going to be probably one of the largest States in the Union in population. I know the keen rivalry that exists between California and Florida. California has a big group of fine people. Both States have grown rapidly. I understand California is going to take 7 Representatives in the next realignment of the population, and Florida is going to get 3 new ones.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not prevail.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Nebraska has adequately answered the amendment which is proposed by the gentleman from California, but I think his figures need amending in one particular. The gentleman gave figures as to the population at time of admission. When we take the population of preceding censuses or at succeeding censuses for the other States, which were admitted to the Union, and examine them in the light of this amendment, we find there would be only 10 States in this Union of ours today if the gentleman's amendment had been in effect at the time this Union was started. We would have a great Union today of the States of Maine, New Mexico, Washington, West Virginia, Maryland, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Oklahoma—that would comprise the United States of America today if the test which the gentleman from California seeks to impose had been in effect since the formation of our Union. The plain fact of the matter is that Alaska today has more population according to the census figures than 29 of the 48 States in the Union had at the time of their admission, and I do not think it would be fair to impose this kind of test on Alaska today when our history proves that the States have rapidly grown in population after their admission into the Union.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. If this test had been applied by our Founding Fathers, we would never have had the United States of America because most of the States of the Union that formed the original 13 States could not have qualified.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Even the great State of New York, the most populous State in the Union today had only 238,000 people at the time New York came into the Union.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I would like to point out, or at least to allege, that the gentle-

man is comparing oranges with apples by these figures because he fails to state that the total population of the United States at the time these other States were admitted was a great deal less and, therefore, the situation is simply not comparable.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I will grant that the gentleman has a point there, but I will say to him that if we had imposed an arbitrary test of any kind back in the early years of our history, we would not have the great Union we have today, and I must decline to yield further to the gentleman at this point.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other argument I would like to dispose of before sitting down. The argument has been made by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia that there is a question as to how the people of Alaska stand on this question because of a poll which a gentleman from another State conducted in that Territory. I think the test which the Members of this House have always been willing to impose as to what the people want is the test of the question of how the representatives of that area vote and the stand that they take in this body. We have a clear demonstration of that here. We have the distinguished Delegate from Alaska who is here telling us that the people of Alaska want statehood. We have two Senators under the Tennessee plan and a Representative too, under the Tennessee plan, the representatives and the spokesmen of the people of Alaska who are here and telling all of us directly that their people want statehood for Alaska. I say to you to take what a few editorials say on this question or to take what a poll conducted by a Member from outside the jurisdiction of Alaska says on the question rather than what the elected representatives of the people would say would be a departure from the very foundation principles that govern this House and in the way we do business. We believe the representative of an area speaks for the people and we believe that representative reflects the feeling, the thoughts and the desires of the people. We have convincing evidence on this floor that the people of Alaska want statehood because their representatives are here fighting with every bit of strength that they have and with all their ability to obtain statehood. I hope we will go along with those representatives. I hope we will go along with the people of Alaska. I hope we will go along with the people of America on this subject. Legislatures of many States have demonstrated by resolutions how they stand. I hope we will go along with the destiny of America and add the 49th star to our flag and demonstrate to the entire world that America believes in progress. That we believe in democracy for all our people and that we are willing to stand by those principles in this year of 1958.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder how many of my colleagues know how Pravda and Izvestia, printed in the Soviet Union, feel toward the treaty, negotiated in 1867, under the then czar, which sold to the United States the Territory of Alaska. These newspapers describe the area as Russian-America and they contend that the czar had no right to alienate "sacred Russian soil."

When I was first elected to the Congress, in 1940, the delegate from Alaska was Anthony J. Dimond. This very able and very dedicated delegate, pleading for proper defenses for Alaska, prophesied before Pearl Harbor, that the Japanese would attack without warning. Not heeding the Delegate's prophesy, Alaska became the only part of our North American Continent to be invaded and held for a time by the enemy.

I recall a speech once made by Tony Dimond in which he expressed great concern that thousands of Russians, supposedly colonists, were being settled on Big Diomed Island in Bering Strait only 5 miles from Little Diomed, an American island. Commenting on Mr. Dimond's remarks, the New York Times stated:

The thousands of young Russian men and women who are being settled in northeast Siberia are all representatives of the younger generation that has matured entirely under Soviet control. They are said to be carried away with the idea that they are to be the glorious conquerors of the world, that they must sow the seeds of revolution everywhere, and that, to quote from a Vladivostok newspaper, "Their mission first of all is to get their hands on Alaska which so idiotically was sold to capitalist America by the czarist government."

Tony Dimond often spoke about Soviet Russia's aggressive intentions. Had we taken his warnings to heart, we might possibly not have committed the folly of holding back our victorious troops in Europe and allowing the Russians to occupy Berlin and Austria.

Today, I, for one, am voting to admit to full partnership in our Union that most vital of all American areas, Alaska. I, for one, am anxious to set at rest forever the fantastic Russian claim that Alaska still belongs to Russia and the Russians should have it back.

Mr. Chairman, I note sitting before me as I speak the distinguished and able Delegate who succeeded Anthony Dimond to represent the Territory of Alaska. He has been with us 14 years. He is not a Member of the Congress of the United States, because he is not a Representative and he is not a Senator. No. He is not one of us. He is only a Delegate under the Constitution, with a voice in this body but no vote.

I remember how Tony Dimond in yesterday spoke about his frustration because of that anomalous situation.

Now I am going to ask the Delegate if he will not rise and during my time tell the House something about his own frustration in not being able to vote as a Member of the Congress of the United States of America.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad to respond to the question asked by my friend from New Jersey. Before doing so I should like to say that I am happy he brought the name of Tony Dimond

into this discussion. He was a good man, a great American. His was the true voice of prophecy; had we heeded his warning in the thirties, there would have been no disaster in the Aleutians in World War II and, as the gentleman so properly said, the situation would have been different had we heeded that which he had to say after World War II.

I can say to the gentleman after long experience here—this is my seventh term—that personally I am rather inured to being here in a position of Delegate without a vote; but I can say that it remains most frustrating.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MASON. I object.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am sure my friend is not really going to object. I am sure he wants to be fair to the Delegate.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I have objected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has observed that the gentleman from Illinois has objected.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and yield to the Delegate from Alaska so he may finish his statement.

Mr. CANFIELD. I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado because, most certainly, the Delegate who is sent to this body, who has no vote, has the right to speak.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. CANFIELD. The regular order is being observed.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Colorado yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is being observed.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I was about to say a moment ago that it is not too frustrating on a personal basis to be here representing a Territory, but daily I grieve for the citizens there who pay all Federal taxes which apply to citizens of the States, who are bound by all the Federal laws that apply to the citizens of the other States but have no right to vote in this Congress of the United States, and who in so many other ways occupy inferior status.

I would say that, granted the fact that territories are commonly, traditionally, required to serve periods of tutelage, that 90 years ought to be long enough. Alaska has been an incorporated Territory since 1868, the year after its purchase from Russia for the terrifically low sum of \$7,200,000.

Alaska is made up 85 percent of citizens from the 48 States, and I think they have gone through school; they are entitled now to their diploma so that they may have on this floor and in the other body voting representatives instead of a voteless delegate.

I thank the gentleman for giving me this opportunity, and my friend from Colorado also, to say that when you live in a Territory it becomes terribly frus-

trating in that you have no vote to record your opinion on any subject of national or international importance through your representation in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ASPINALL. May the gentleman from Colorado say that one of the most pleasing experiences that he has had in his 10 years here in the House is that of trying to be helpful to the Delegate from Alaska.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, if he has any further statement he wishes to make.

Mr. CANFIELD. I have no further statement, but again I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Colorado for being so fair in this debate.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when mention of the name of the Delegate from Alaska was made a moment ago I felt impelled to join with those who were expressing words of commendation for him and also his predecessor, because, coming from that area of the country which is so close to Alaska, we, in my District, know the Delegate well. He is almost like a citizen in Seattle. When he walks along the street, everybody knows him. He is almost like a member of our chamber of commerce. We feel very warmly toward him. We admire the great work he has done, and I know that I am only expressing the sentiments of my District when I join in saying words of commendation and admiration for a very fine gentleman, the Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no one more deserving the tributes which have just been paid to him by his colleagues than the Delegate from Alaska, BOB BARTLETT.

I have had the good fortune to have worked with Delegate BARTLETT since he came to Congress. My own interest in the problem of statehood for Alaska has developed because of the contacts I have had with him. He has always been most fair in his presentations in behalf of the Territory and I am certain that the great good he has accomplished for Alaska has resulted from the high personal esteem in which he is held by Members on both sides of the aisle. This has been evident during the consideration of the statehood bill during the past week.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate my support for H. R. 7999 granting statehood to Alaska. There have been many arguments over the last several days, pro and con, over this proposed legislation. There has been one argument in particular I would like to refute. That is one having to do with the claim Alaska is not ready for statehood. I think that if we subscribe to the arguments advanced by those who raise this issue we would disregard precedent and history. If our predecessors in this body had subscribed to such arguments, the western boundary of this great country of ours would not have extended beyond the Mississippi River. We must remember that many great States in the Union, stars represented in that blue field up there, would not have been admitted to the Union if we had subscribed to those kind of arguments.

Under the conditions laid down by some, my own great State of Illinois would not have been admitted to statehood back in 1818. I have read the debate in Congress on the question of admission of Illinois. The opponents talked then as the opponents of Alaska's statehood talk today. Fortunately their arguments did not prevail. You may say that in time Illinois would have been admitted anyway—but how can we be certain it would have? Had the opponents of statehood of the many States which have been admitted to the Union subsequent to the founding of our Nation by the Original Thirteen been in majority we might well have a dozen or more independent nations where today we have one Nation united. Our predecessors showed great wisdom in rejecting negative arguments in the cases of Illinois and the others and I predict the judgment of the House membership will be just as sound here this afternoon.

The granting of Territorial status to Alaska more than 80 years ago carried with it a guaranty that someday this area would be admitted into the Union. Its people are entitled to full status of American citizenship. They must be growing impatient in their present position as wards of the Nation. They cannot be expected to endure such a status much longer. They have served the necessary period of tutelage. We could not blame them if they became tired of being half citizens and demanded statehood or independence.

Now, in effect, they are living under circumstances strongly reminiscent of those which compelled our forefathers to revolt against British rule. Subject to all Federal taxes imposed generally, they have no right to express an effective voice in the making of the tax or other laws.

For these reasons I favor statehood for Alaska, but there is to me an even greater reason why I will vote to admit Alaska to the Union, and that is because the history of the United States shows that real development of an area has started only when Territorial status was changed to statehood.

Yes, and for selfish reason as an American, I want this great Territory as a State of the Union. It abounds in untold natural resources. I want these preserved for the United States. You say we can preserve them as well by holding Alaska as a Territory. I refer you back to my previous remarks; people grow impatient as second-class citizens and they are prone to do something about it in time. It would be far better to grant statehood now than to ferment a condition that would lead to a demand for independence that could embarrass the United States in the family of nations. The Alaskans make no such threat—have not even advanced a hint in that direction—but we may very well be creating such a hazard by rejecting this measure today.

Since statehood will accelerate the development of the area, it is of the utmost importance from a military standpoint—but I went into that in detail yesterday. Recently the commanding general of the Alaskan department stated that military defense of Alaska could not be effective

unless there is a growth in the civilian population and civilian industry. Statehood would aid materially in bringing this about.

Alaska has a population of about 212,000 today, exceeding the population of 12 States at the time of their admission into the Union. Few States can match her in resources. Her tremendous resources have barely been touched. Her timber, minerals, and her water-power have not been tapped. All these things make her a necessary factor in the defense of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. The State of Alaska shall consist of all the territory, together with the territorial waters appurtenant thereto, now included in the Territory of Alaska.

Sec. 3. The constitution of the State of Alaska shall always be republican in form and shall not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

Sec. 4. As a compact with the United States said State and its people do agree and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to any lands or other property not granted or confirmed to the State or its political subdivisions by or under the authority of this act, the right or title to which is held by the United States or is subject to disposition by the United States, and to any lands or other property (including fishing rights), the right or title to which may be held by any Indians, Eskimos, or Aleuts (hereinafter called natives) or is held by the United States in trust for said natives; that all such lands or other property, belonging to the United States or which may belong to said natives, shall be and remain under the absolute jurisdiction and control of the United States until disposed of under its authority, except to such extent as the Congress has prescribed or may hereafter prescribe, and except when held by individual natives in fee without restrictions on alienation: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall recognize, deny, enlarge, impair, or otherwise affect any claim against the United States, and any such claim shall be governed by the laws of the United States applicable thereto; and nothing in this act is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation, or construction by the Congress that any law applicable thereto authorizes, establishes, recognizes, or confirms the validity or invalidity of any such claim, and the determination of the applicability or effect of any law to any such claim shall be unaffected by anything in this act: *And provided further*, That no taxes shall be imposed by said State upon any lands or other property now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States or which, as hereinabove set forth, may belong to said natives, except to such extent as the Congress has prescribed or may hereafter prescribe, and except when held by individual natives in fee without restrictions on alienation.

Sec. 5. The State of Alaska and its political subdivisions, respectively, shall have and retain title to all property, real and personal, title to which is in the Territory of Alaska or any of the subdivisions. Except as provided in section 6 hereof, the United States shall retain title to all property, real and personal, to which it has title, including public lands.

Sec. 6. (a) For the purposes of furthering the development of and expansion of communities, the State of Alaska is hereby granted and shall be entitled to select, within 50 years after the date of the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, from lands within national forests in Alaska which are vacant and unappropriated at the time of their selection not to

exceed 400,000 acres of land, and from the other public lands of the United States in Alaska which are vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved at the time of their selection not to exceed another 400,000 acres of land, all of which shall be adjacent to established communities or suitable for prospective community centers and recreational areas. Such lands shall be selected by the State of Alaska with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture as to national forest lands and with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior as to other public lands: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry under the laws of the United States, whether for homestead, mineral, right-of-way, or other purposes whatsoever, or shall affect the rights of any such owner, claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of the land so occupied.

(b) The State of Alaska, in addition to any other grants made in this section, is hereby granted and shall be entitled to select, within 25 years after the admission of Alaska into the Union, not to exceed 182 million acres from the public lands of the United States in Alaska which are vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved at the time of their selection: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry under the laws of the United States, whether for homestead, mineral, right-of-way, or other purpose whatsoever, or shall affect the rights of any such owner, claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of the lands so occupied: *And provided further*, That no selection hereunder shall be made in the area north and west of the line described in section 10 without approval of the President or his designated representative.

(c) Block 32, and the structures and improvements thereon, in the city of Juneau are granted to the State of Alaska for any or all of the following purposes or a combination thereof: A residence for the Governor, a State museum, or park and recreational use.

(d) Block 19, and the structures and improvements thereon, and the interests of the United States in blocks C and 7, and the structures and improvements thereon, in the city of Juneau, are hereby granted to the State of Alaska.

(e) All real and personal property of the United States situated in the Territory of Alaska which is specifically used for the sole purpose of conservation and protection of the fisheries and wildlife of Alaska, under the provisions of the Alaska game law of July 1, 1943 (57 Stat. 301; 48 U. S. C., secs. 192-211), as amended, and under the provisions of the Alaska commercial fisheries laws of June 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 478; 48 U. S. C., secs. 230-239 and 241-242), and June 6, 1924 (43 Stat. 465; 48 U. S. C., secs. 221-228), as supplemented and amended, shall be transferred and conveyed to the State of Alaska by the appropriate Federal agency: *Provided*, That such transfer shall not include lands withdrawn or otherwise set apart as refuges or reservations for the protection of wildlife nor facilities utilized in connection therewith, or in connection with general research activities relating to fisheries or wildlife. Sums of money that are available for apportionment or which the Secretary of the Interior shall have apportioned, as of the date the State of Alaska shall be deemed to be admitted into the Union, for wildlife restoration in the Territory of Alaska, pursuant to section 8 (a) of the act of September 2, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C., sec. 669g-1), and for fish restoration and management in the Territory of Alaska, pursuant to section 12 of the act of August 9, 1950 (16 U. S. C., sec. 777k), shall continue to be available for the period, and under the terms and conditions in effect at the time,

the apportionments are made. Commencing with the year during which Alaska is admitted into the Union, the Secretary of the Treasury, at the close of each fiscal year, shall pay to the State of Alaska 70 percent of the net proceeds, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, derived during such fiscal year from all sales of sealskins or sea-otter skins made in accordance with the provisions of the act of February 26, 1944 (58 Stat. 100; 16 U. S. C., secs. 631a-631q), as supplemented and amended. In arriving at the net proceeds, there shall be deducted from the receipts from all sales all costs to the United States in carrying out the provisions of the act of February 26, 1944, as supplemented and amended, including, but not limited to, the costs of handling and dressing the skins, the costs of making the sales, and all expenses incurred in the administration of the Pribilof Islands. Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting the rights of the United States under the provisions of the act of February 26, 1944, as supplemented and amended, and the act of June 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 325), as amended (16 U. S. C., sec. 772 et seq.).

(f) Five percent of the proceeds of sale of public lands lying within said State which shall be sold by the United States subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union, after deducting all the expenses incident to such sales, shall be paid to said State to be used for the support of the public schools within said State.

(g) Except as provided in subsection (a), all lands granted in quantity to and authorized to be selected by the State of Alaska by this act shall be selected in such manner as the laws of the State may provide, and in conformity with such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe. All selections shall be made in reasonably compact tracts, taking into account the situation and potential uses of the lands involved, and each tract selected shall contain at least 5,760 acres unless isolated from other tracts open to selection. The authority to make selections shall never be alienated or bargained away, in whole or in part, by the State. Upon the revocation of any order of withdrawal in Alaska, the order of revocation shall provide for a period of not less than 90 days before the date on which it otherwise becomes effective, if subsequent to the admission of Alaska into the Union, during which period the State of Alaska shall have a preferred right of selection, subject to the requirements of this act, except as against prior existing valid rights or as against equitable claims subject to allowance and confirmation. Such preferred right of selection shall have precedence over the preferred right of application created by section 4 of the act of September 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 748; 43 U. S. C., sec. 282), as now or hereafter amended, but not over other preference rights now conferred by law. Where any lands desired by the State are unsurveyed at the time of their selection, the Secretary of the Interior shall survey the exterior boundaries of the area requested without any interior subdivision thereof and shall issue a patent for such selected area in terms of the exterior boundary survey; where any lands desired by the State are surveyed at the time of their selection, the boundaries of the area requested shall conform to the public land subdivisions established by the approval of the survey. All lands duly selected by the State of Alaska pursuant to this act shall be patented to the State by the Secretary of the Interior. Following the selection of lands by the State and the tentative approval of such selection by the Secretary of the Interior or his designee, but prior to the issuance of final patent, the State is hereby authorized to execute conditional leases and to make conditional sales of such selected lands. As used in this subsection, the words "equitable claims subject to allowance and confir-

mation" include, without limitation, claims of holders of permits issued by the Department of Agriculture on lands eliminated from national forests, whose permits have been terminated only because of such elimination and who own valuable improvements on such lands.

(h) Any lease, permit, license, or contract issued under the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U. S. C., sec. 181 and following), as amended, or under the Alaska Coal Leasing Act of October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741; 30 U. S. C., sec. 432 and following), as amended, shall have the effect of withdrawing the lands subject thereto from selection by the State of Alaska under this act, unless such lease, permit, license, or contract is in effect on the date of approval of this act, and unless an application to select such lands is filed with the Secretary of the Interior within a period of 5 years after the date of the admission of Alaska into the Union. Such selections shall be made only from lands that are otherwise open to selection under this act, and shall include the entire area that is subject to each lease, permit, license, or contract involved in the selections. Any patent for lands so selected shall vest in the State of Alaska all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any such lease, permit, license, or contract that remains outstanding on the effective date of the patent, including the right to all rentals, royalties, and other payments accruing after that date under such lease, permit, license, or contract, and including any authority that may have been retained by the United States to modify the terms and conditions of such lease, permit, license, or contract: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall affect the continued validity of any such lease, permit, license, or contract or any rights arising thereunder.

(i) All grants made or confirmed under this act shall include mineral deposits. The grants of mineral lands to the State of Alaska under subsections (a) and (b) of this section are made upon the express condition that all sales, grants, deeds, or patents for any of the mineral lands so granted shall be subject to and contain a reservation to the State of all of the minerals in the lands so sold, granted, deeded, or patented, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same. Mineral deposits in such lands shall be subject to lease by the State as the State legislature may direct: *Provided*, That any lands or minerals hereafter disposed of contrary to the provisions of this section shall be forfeited to the United States by appropriate proceedings instituted by the Attorney General for that purpose in the United States District Court for the District of Alaska.

(j) The schools and colleges provided for in this act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the State, or its governmental subdivisions, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands granted herein for educational purposes shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university.

(k) Grants previously made to the Territory of Alaska are hereby confirmed and transferred to the State of Alaska upon its admission. Effective upon the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, section 1 of the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214; 48 U. S. C., sec. 353), as amended, and the last sentence of section 35 of the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 450; 30 U. S. C., sec. 191), as amended, are repealed and all lands therein reserved under the provisions of section 1 as of the date of this act shall, upon the admission of said State into the Union, be granted to said State for the purposes for which they were reserved; but such repeal shall not affect any outstanding lease, permit, license, or contract issued under said section 1, as amended, or any rights or powers

with respect to such lease, permit, license, or contract, and shall not affect the disposition of the proceeds or income derived prior to such repeal from any lands reserved under said section 1, as amended, or derived thereafter from any disposition of the reserved lands or an interest therein made prior to such repeal.

(l) The grants provided for in this act shall be in lieu of the grant of land for purposes of internal improvements made to new States by section 8 of the act of September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 455), and sections 2378 and 2379 of the Revised Statutes (43 U. S. C., sec. 857), and in lieu of the swamp-land grant made by the act of September 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 520), and section 2479 of the Revised Statutes (43 U. S. C., sec. 982), and in lieu of the grant of 30,000 acres for each Senator and Representative in Congress made by the act of July 2, 1862, as amended (12 Stat. 503; 7 U. S. C., secs. 301-308), which grants are hereby declared not to extend to the State of Alaska.

(m) The Submerged Lands Act of 1953 (Public Law 31, 83d Cong., 1st sess.; 67 Stat. 29) shall be applicable to the State of Alaska and the said State shall have the same rights as do existing States thereunder.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAWSON of Utah: On page 4, line 13, strike the word "fifty" and insert the word "twenty-five."

On page 5, lines 10 and 11, strike the words "one hundred and eighty-two million" and insert "one hundred and two million five hundred and fifty thousand."

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, these two amendments bring the bill in line with the figures presented in the original bill as introduced by the gentleman from Alaska and other authors of bills. The acreage was increased in committee. Some objection was made there—and I think rightly so—the large amount of land that was granted to the State of Alaska. I think the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] made a case on yesterday that justifies some reduction in the total acreage granted to the new State. By reducing the figure from 182 million to 102 million, we reduce the total percentage from some 50 percent to 27 percent of the land in Alaska. This, in my opinion, is a much more realistic figure than 50 percent. It is true, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has stated, that this is a much larger grant, even with the reduction that is now proposed, than any other State in the Union has had. I feel, however, that this amount of land is needed in order to give the new State a sufficient tax base to allow a reasonable assurance of its future existence.

The other amendment relates to the reduction of the selection time from 50 years to 25 years for the lands in the national forests and in my opinion that also is reasonable. We would hate to see a situation develop in Alaska where the new State could wait for the lands to come into mineral production or commercial development and then take over. For that reason I feel that 25 years would be sufficient time for that development to take place and for the new State to make a reasonable selection.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will see fit to accept this amendment.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, as part of the committee, I am not ready to accept the amendment and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was adopted by the full committee, and, as I remember it, the gentleman from Utah voted for the amendment when it was in the committee. It was adopted unanimously.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I am not so sure that that is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am not ready now to agree that the committee shall rescind the action just because somebody simply offers an amendment and to say that we accept the amendment. We adopted these figures in the committee. What does it do? It gives the new State about one-half of its land. The Federal Government has already taken 100 million acres of selected land that it wants for itself—100 million acres. I have always been under the impression that neither the Federal Government nor a State can properly develop its own resources. Generally it is the individual who goes out on his own initiative, with his courage and his willingness to work, that develops the resources of the land.

I believe that 25 percent of all the land in the United States is owned by the Federal Government. In the 11 Western States 50 percent of the land is owned by the Federal Government. If we adopted the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON], it would mean 102 million acres of land would go to the new State, and that is about 28 percent of their land. If Members will look at page 89 of the report you will see that in the 11 Western States it ranges all the way from 85 percent in the State of Washington that is owned by the Federal Government to 84 percent in the State of Nevada.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. In my own State, even today, the Federal Government owns 73 percent of all the land area. Yet, if this amendment were adopted we would give the new State of Alaska 27 percent of their total area.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think we might well say that one reason the gentleman's State has not grown very much is that so much of the land is owned by the Federal Government. Utah had 210,000 people when it came into the Union in 1896. What is its population now, about a third of a million?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. About 1 million.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The State has not grown very much because the Federal Government has seen fit to hold onto all of the land. In my humble opinion, if you want to develop a territory, turn it over to the State, and let us hope that there is wise economic and political leadership in the State so that they, in turn, will turn it back to the people who will come there from every

State in the Union, in this case, who will go to Alaska, to the new State, so that they may carve out their own destiny by taking a piece of land and develop the resources. If there is coal, or if there is gold, or one or another of a dozen different strategic minerals that we need in this country, including lumber, then they, themselves, as individuals, can work out their destiny through the ownership of that land. But you cannot do that if you say to a new State, "We will give you just a little bit of land and hope you get along on it." I have 1 county in my District of 38 counties that is larger than Delaware and Rhode Island, in square miles, not in people. They have almost as many cattle, but not people. So you cannot judge this new State on a square-mile basis.

I will go along with a 25-year limitation, instead of 50 years, for the new State to select its land, but let the State divide that land. They may have some homestead law or mineral law so that individuals from every State in the Union can go up there, and they can divide their resources. If we say the Federal Government is going to hold onto most of the land it will not be developed. I did not vote for this bill in the 81st Congress because we were not then giving them very much of the land and only 6 percent of their land. A State, to grow and develop must have most of its land. I think I was right at the time. The bill did not carry. I think you weaken the bill here when you say to the State, "We will let you have 23 percent of your land," when in the first place the Federal Government has already selected 100 million acres of that land.

I suggest the amendments to give less land to the new State be defeated.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to state that my support of the amendment does not mean that I am in violent disagreement with the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska. The gentleman from Nebraska in the committee strongly advocated the 184 million acres. One of the reasons I went along with that larger amount was that I believed the gentleman from Nebraska to be a conservative man in his approach to all these problems. If he felt as a conservative gentleman that the larger amount of land was necessary I was willing to yield to his views. I still believe that he was right. I still believe that if we are to create a new State, a State of such size and undoubted importance, we should give it as many of the sinews of statehood as possible.

I think we have here in the statement by the gentleman from Nebraska an answer to many of those who talk about giveaway. Here is the gentleman from Nebraska, a conservative gentleman, who says we should give more, not less, of this land. Here is the gentleman from Nebraska, a conservative gentleman, who tells you he sees no prospect of looting the public treasury by permitting people of a new State to lease to private enterprise these mineral lands which should be developed in the interest of the entire Nation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If they are going to loot 182 million acres, what safeguard are you going to have so they will not loot 102 million acres?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I think the answer might be that the difference could be the difference between petty larceny and grand larceny, but I do not believe there is larceny of any kind possible.

One point should be emphasized. What loot are we talking about here? We now give the Territory of Alaska 90 percent of all the revenue from mineral leases by the Federal Government. Under this bill, we will give 100 percent plus the cost of administering it. So moneywise they will be in exactly the same posture as they are in now. So I am very happy that the gentleman from Nebraska explained why he favors this provision as it stands. Nevertheless, I have always believed it is a mistake to stumble over a pebble on your way to a mountain top and I believe this amendment would be a reasonable compromise.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas to the amendment offered by Mr. DAWSON of Utah: Strike out "102,000,000" and insert "21,000,000."

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in view of the controversy which seems to have arisen within the Committee here about how much land is going to get looted up there, I thought, perhaps, we had better reduce it down to the amount that had been included in the former bills that have been presented to the Congress on this subject. When we weigh this whole problem out, we find that 21 million acres should be plenty of land if you are going to grant statehood to Alaska; everybody talks in percentages but no one talks in figures. They talk about how much land the Federal Government owns throughout this Nation, but they never tell you that a lot of that land is owned by the Federal Government because no one else can afford to own it. The gentleman from Utah was talking about how much land in his State was owned by the Federal Government. Now, who can afford to own these mountain tops? Why they could not even pay the taxes on them. Of course, that is all counted. And they talk about it percentagewise, but they never tell you how many fertile acres there are and they never tell you anything about that, but they just talk about percentages and they have you going on percentages. But Alaska gets to choose this land and they are not going to choose mountain tops or swamps. Let us look at this thing from the standpoint of how much land would be allocated to each citizen of Alaska. At the present time, if you gave them 21 million acres—now you figure it, I am not a very good mathematician—how many people are there up there, some say there are 80,000 people and others

say there are 180,000 people, but it makes no difference—each citizen up there would get a tremendous amount of land under this 21 million acres provision. In addition to the 21 million acres, do not forget this one point that was made yesterday that this proposed State is brought in under the submarginal land act. That includes, as I understand it, 3 miles out from the shore. If you just stop and think about the shoreline of Alaska—think how fantastic it is because if you go 3 miles out for every mile of shoreline you would have 2,000 acres of land that the State of Alaska would get. You look at the map of the State of Alaska and just look at the stupendous amount of land and the amount of mineral rights that would be going to the State of Alaska outside of what is included in the bill, as you might call it, dry land. So it just occurs to me, if this is going to be a matter of turning over this land that belongs to all the people of the United States of America at the present time, if you turn this land over to Alaska, let us be reasonable about it. The gentleman wants to be conservative and I do too. Let us turn 21 million acres over to them, if you are going to pass this bill anyway, and then if they need more land they can come back and get it later on. There is nothing to keep this Congress from giving them more land at the next session of the Congress. But, if we give them all of the land now, we cannot take any of it back. We cannot take any of it back and the chances are Alaska is not going to give it back to us. So let us go about this thing in a reasonable way and not just go whole hog and turn the whole thing over and say, "Well, we are destroying the Republic so we might as well do a good job of it and give away all the land—we do not need it anyway."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would like to remind the gentleman from Texas that the amount of land he proposes here is less than one-half that which was sought to be conveyed in the 1950 act.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. How much land would the 21 million acres be for each citizen of Alaska at the present time?

Mr. BARTLETT. Oh, I do not know how much land it would be, but it would be no land for each citizen. It would all go to the State. It would not be divided equally.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. But I mean the State is made up of citizens.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman is applying a new rule, but what he is doing is seeking to cut the land grants by 50 percent from the lowest figure that ever came to the House before.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If I remember right, those other bills were defeated, so there must have been something wrong with them. Maybe it was the land business.

Mr. BARTLETT. Oh, no. I remind the gentleman that the bill which was passed on March 3, 1950, contained approximately twice as much land as he proposes in his amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. What happened to that bill?

Mr. BARTLETT. It perished elsewhere.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is what I mean. It never did become law.

Mr. BARTLETT. No.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. Is it not possible for this Congress to grant to Alaska at any time any amount of its land, regardless of whether or not the statehood bill is adopted? Even though it were defeated, this Congress could next day grant whatever it deems to be fair, such lands as the Congress might want to give to Alaska.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I will say to the gentleman it seems to me, according to the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] we have given them quite a bit of it already and certainly we could handle the matter in the future.

Mr. PILLION. One section out of each township. Is that not correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the position taken by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER]. I do not believe that I find myself in extreme controversy with my chairman, the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]. I just happen to be one of those fellows who do not believe that we are giving anything away. In the proposal which the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] mentioned, it was discussed in our committee, at great length, and 182 million acres was felt to be needed, in order to give the new State a proper economic base. After all, we talk about the fact that in California we have the Federal Government owning 50 percent of the land; in Utah 80-some percent of the land, and so on. The people who live in the State and who work there, who develop it, are Americans, and they are there developing and working generally along with everyone else in the country to build and strengthen this country in which we live. I just do not grasp this idea that because we permit a State to have some few million acres of land that we are giving it to anybody or that it represents a giveaway to anybody. It will be used by American citizens in an American State, a part of this great Union in which we live.

To go back to the discussion, I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] because this certainly reduces the area which Alaska would have an opportunity to develop far below the minimum required. As far as the discussion between the gentlemen from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is concerned, I personally shall vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON], because I believe that the 182 million acres is not too much land, when we consider the fact that that would

still be only 50 percent of the total land area of the new State of Alaska.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is it not correct that under the committee bill as it now stands 183 million acres of land are reserved to the United States, and under the Dawson amendment there would be 263 million acres reserved to the United States? So when the gentleman from Texas argues that we might as well go whole hog on those propositions he is neglecting the fact that there is a reservation in both these committee positions of more than half the land in Alaska to the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. SISK. The gentleman is exactly correct on that, completely.

I wish to say that I am happy my colleague from Utah introduced this amendment because I think it is up to the House after hearing and discussing the various proposals to make a determination of the amount of land they want to go to the State.

I shall support the position of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] because I believe he is right in his argument. If you choose to support the position of the gentleman from Utah and the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], then certainly that is your prerogative.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. Yes; I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman spoke about the amount of land in California and other States, the portion owned by the State, the portion owned by the Federal Government. It is true, but does the gentleman consider that a good thing?

Mr. SISK. I do not consider it to be a good thing. That is exactly the reason why I am opposing it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. In the State of Iowa, the last time I checked, less than one-half of 1 percent was publicly owned land. It was practically all privately owned, and we out there always thought it ought to be privately owned; it pays taxes then.

Mr. SISK. I agree with the gentleman completely; and that, I will say, is the reason for the position I have taken.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The gentleman, as a member of the committee, I am sure will agree with me that all we have been trying to do in the committee was to reach an agreement on what would be a fair allocation. Of course, we can take any one of these arguments and say, "Let us cut it down" or "Let us extend it up to 100 percent." But if you want to be realistic about it the reason the 102-million-acre figure was offered was because that was the amount of the original bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I made some remarks on this bill yesterday and somebody said I was drawing a red herring across the trail; but I think from the looks of things I struck pay dirt.

When you start reading the bill you do not know just what it does. The bill is so defective that the advocates of the bill are now fighting amongst themselves. One bunch of them wants 182 million acres, another bunch wants 102 million acres; I do not want any million. So I think that what has happened here this afternoon on this bill pretty well illustrates the immaturity of this bill for serious consideration by the House when the Members who worked so long over it and came to such almost unanimity of opinion as to what was the final right thing to do about it, on the very first important amendment that is offered we find them fighting amongst themselves. Now, how are we poor, ignorant folks going to know what to do about it?

The Delegate from Alaska says that the last bill carried 42 million acres; the gentleman from Texas said it carried 21 million acres. I do not know that it makes much difference, but as a matter of fact, I had all these bills that have been introduced for statehood for Alaska analyzed to see just how much giveaway there was in them and how much tremendous giveaway there was in this particular bill.

According to the analysis given me, the only bill that ever passed this House after serious consideration and debate was in the 81st Congress, and according to my analysis that bill gave 21 million acres to Alaska. Then they have been jumping up, jumping up, and jumping up every bill since until they have given away in this bill everything that Alaska apparently is willing to accept as a gift, and now the committee is fighting amongst themselves. Now, no doubt we will get into other amendments on this bill. I am not going to offer any; I have said my say about it, so I am not going to propose to amend the bill. Let it stay like it is and see what the House wants to do. But, I would like to admonish these gentlemen, who are such sincere advocates of the bill and all of whom are so sure that their position is dead right, please get together on these amendments, and if you cannot agree among yourselves, I do not see how you can ask the membership of this House to vote for this bill. Now, that is the situation, and we are starting off here with the committee themselves quarreling about whether we shall give them everything or whether we shall give them this or that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not think there is really any quarrel about it. I was trying to hold up the committee's position of 182 million acres. Of course, the gentleman from Texas did not want Alaska to be larger than Texas, because Texas has 168,648,320 acres. They reserved all of their land when they came into the Union. We did not take an acre away from them.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman is always fair, and he ought to add

to that that Texas did not come in by the grace of the United States as a possession. Texas came into this Union by treaty.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Since the gentleman from Nevada mentioned the State of Texas, Texas offered to give up the land when they came in, but they refused to take it. They said it was nothing but frog ponds, I believe, out there. And, they have been sorry ever since.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I believe that Texas also has the right under its treaty to divide itself into five States and have 10 United States Senators up here; is that not right?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not understand why they have never taken advantage of it. But, if they are going to have five States, it has been suggested to me—and I think by the gentleman from Texas—that there ought to be an amendment to this bill to let Alaska divide itself into 10 States, because it is twice as big as Texas. I do not know whether there will be any objection to that amendment or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. You know, as we come along Pennsylvania Avenue we see on the Archives Building, I think it is, "What is past is prologue." "Study the Past." Well, the greatest land scandal in the history of this Nation was what they called the Yazoo scandal. When Georgia came into the Union, the United States Government turned over countless acres of land to the State of Georgia. They took three Indian territories and they added that to the State of Georgia and went right to the Mississippi River. So, Georgia extended from the Atlantic Ocean to the Mississippi River, and they gave them the same rights in the bill as we give the legislature in Alaska. We gave them the same rights at that time. In Georgia, there were three land companies formed, and when the investigation came about they found out that every member of the Georgia Legislature, with the exception of one member, had been involved and was a partner in these land settlement development corporations. And, they sold the land anywhere from 1½ to 5 cents an acre. It was the greatest scandal in the history of this Nation. Washington sent a special message to the Congress asking the Congress to investigate. It took years and years and years of litigation. Now, here we are today, one group wanting to give away 182 million acres of property that belongs to the people who live in my District and who live in your District, on which is found the greatest mineral wealth and the greatest forestry reserve in the world. That belongs to the people of my District and it belongs to the people of your District, and we have no right to give it away.

There is another group in the House that is not so benevolent as the first group. They want to give away only 101 million acres of the land and the property which belongs to the people of the United States. The gentleman from Texas is rather miserly in his thoughts; he wants to give them only 21 million acres.

If there is ever going to be another Yazoo land scandal, if we are going to make the biggest giveaway in the history of this Nation, let us start with only 21 million acres. Please, let us not go hogwild completely.

Personally I am in opposition to the bill. I am going to vote against it regardless of what amendment is adopted, because I honestly believe that the minerals up there, the fishing rights, the great forests up there, belong to all the people of America. I do not think we have any right to delegate to a handful of people in a legislature in Alaska the authority to give away property that belongs to the people of America.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Is the gentleman aware that the State of Alaska would get only 400,000 acres of all the tremendous forest lands up there, the rest being reserved by the United States?

Mr. O'NEILL. I have read the bill. I know that it said that they have a period of 25 or 50 years in which to go in and pick out lots of 5,000 acres each.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Except the forests.

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman knows and I know that for the next 25 years, those people who are up there, after having made surveys, are not going to take up the useless property. They are going to pick out the best property.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Is the gentleman familiar with the Teapot Dome scandal when the leasing was done under the Federal Government, and not the State government?

Mr. O'NEILL. Certainly I am familiar with that. But I think in writing a bill such as this, and knowing what happened in connection with Teapot Dome and the leasing up there, and knowing about the Yazoo scandal and the leasing and the sales made at that time, the committee should have written some safeguards into a bill of this type.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Does the gentleman know that the State of Alaska may not sell a single foot of mineral land, but may only lease it?

Mr. O'NEILL. Yes; I have read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened in amazement to some of the arguments that have been made before this body, such as those made by the previous speaker. Anyone who has flown over the Territory of Alaska, or who has traveled over it by train knows that there are millions and millions of acres of muskeg in Alaska, tundra. There

are swamps there that breed nothing but mosquitoes in the summertime and are frozen wastes in the wintertime. There are inaccessible bare mountain tops, without trees. It is true that they do have a great quantity of land up there, but the tillable soil in Alaska is limited. There are glacial deposits of gravel lying below most of the topsoil. The topsoil is very thin, except in certain valleys such as Matanuska Valley. If you are going to create a State, then you have to give to that State the type of land which will be an asset and not a total liability.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] has already explained that the Federal Government has protected itself as far as great grants of forest land, and the leasing of oil lands, if that comes about, and their sale. The leasing which was done by the Federal Government at Teapot Dome has been mentioned. I call the attention of the committee to the fact that we voted a Tideland bill a few years ago. I voted for that bill although it was against the principles of my party, but I did so because I knew that in the State of California we exacted up to 50 percent of royalties from the oil companies on those tidelands, and I knew there was no such record of protecting the interests of the people, by the Federal Government. The average leasing charge of the Federal Government is around 8 to 12 percent on Federal lands. But in the State of California we exacted up to 50 percent from the public lands. So I say that your States can protect the natural resources. All of your arguments on the States' jurisdiction, on the closeness of the States relate to this situation and are involved in this instance and it will pertain in the case of Alaska.

As far as giving these resources away to Alaska, it is like talking about giving your daughter a home to live in when she gets married. You give it away but not to a stranger. Anything that is given from the public domain to a 49th State is retained in the Union. It is not like giving it away to some far-off possession overseas that has no part and parcel in the United States Government. We retain everything that we give to the State of Alaska. It is true that the jurisdictional trustee of those lands and resources changes from the Federal Government to the State, but what man among you is going to argue against that from the standpoint of principle?

I see my friends who are against statehood for Alaska using strange arguments, but they are the very first ones that take this well in defense of States rights and the superiority of State jurisdiction.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I simply want to comment as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has jurisdiction of the great public lands in the West, that the traditional States rights position of wanting to give the States the broadest possible tax basis is that taken by the gentleman from Nebraska. We have had an extraordinary situation about this bill. The gentlemen

who are shouting "Giveaway" are those who apparently do not want to have a State that is strong. This is a rather amusing and curious situation.

Mr. HOLFELD. It is an amazing demonstration of how you can ride both ends of a horse going in different directions at the same time.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to consume much of the time of the House on this matter and I shall try to close it quickly. You have heard this debate for several days. You have heard several amendments offered. As yet I have not heard one sound reason why Alaska should be granted statehood. Everything that has been argued on this floor has been some futile attempt to tear down some argument saying Alaska should not be granted statehood.

I think the people who are here representing the people of the present United States of America should weigh this matter very, very carefully. I think we ought to realize the tremendous responsibility that is on our shoulders when we start to vote on this measure.

Much has been said as to what the Russians might think about it if we do not grant Alaska statehood. I do not know how you feel—I say I do not; I believe I do—but, as for me, I want my voice heard around the world. I do not care what the Russians think. I am not voting for or against statehood because of what the Russians might say or what they might not say. We could not please the Russians short of giving them complete domination of the world, and everyone in the sound of my voice knows it. It is high time we stopped listening to the propaganda from the Kremlin and started assuming our own responsibilities and taking care of our own business.

We have here a country, the greatest country in the world, a country that has been built by the people who are here inside of the United States of America. I say to you: When we step from the shores of this great Nation and undertake to take in other States, we are doing something that I think we are going to be very sorry for in the future. You must remember this. Once we step off the shores of this Nation, we move into an entirely new political area. We move into an area that has never been tried. It is untested. This is a terrible time in this world at the present time to be testing new political philosophies. Once we step across that chasm, we cannot return. That is the point of no return. We cannot undo what we have done in order to save this Republic if that should be necessary. I sincerely hope the Members in this Chamber today who have so ably represented their people who have sent them here will weigh these responsibilities that rest on their shoulders when we start to do this, and that you will vote for this motion to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, this is a moment of great decision for our Nation. In a very few seconds, we will either accept or reject the overwhelming demand of all the American people and the solemn pledges of our two great parties that we enrich and strengthen ourselves by admitting this great new state of Alaska into the Union. Members from 41 States have spoken or voted here since last Wednesday in favor of admission. This truly reflects public feeling and makes crystal clear that this is not a north-south, Republican-Democrat, or big State-little State battle. Vocal opposition has come largely and obviously from a handful of Members, distinguished though they may be, most of whom would oppose statehood if everything to which they have objected would be deleted from the bill. They describe a normal precedent and a necessary grant of lands made to insure the full development of this mighty territory as a giveaway when they must know that the mineral rights will be developed by private enterprise under even greater restrictions than now exist. This thing they call the gimmick will help bring into our Nation wealth and greater defense by bringing in a score of vital minerals that we need. Alaska gets 90 percent now of the revenue from mineral leases. Are we going to give the new State less? They decry self-government for Alaska because Alaska with 212,000 people will have two Senators knowing that more than 20 States came into the Union with less, and they grew enormously. I am proud that a majority of Members from the Nation's most populous State, the State of New York, have rejected this selfish view and support this bill. They say the people of Alaska do not want statehood—what nonsense.

Only a few weeks ago primary candidates favoring statehood received 90 percent of the votes as against 10 percent for the candidate favoring a commonwealth. Our future, Mr. Chairman, cries out to us for recognition. The pioneering spirit which made us great demands rekindling. Our Nation is not finished. It need not live on its own fat. Let us tell the world that we keep our promises, that we are still young and vigorous and adventurous. Let us provide elbow room for the 70 million more people who will live in the United States within a generation.

When the roll is called on this motion, let us hear again in this Chamber, as we have during recent days, strong voices of men and women from Maine to California, from Vermont to Oregon, from New Jersey to Louisiana, from New York to Texas, from Washington to Ohio, and from New Hampshire to Florida. Our people want this bill and we are their representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] has expired.

All time has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] prevails, the enacting clause will be stricken in committee. Then do we go into the House and have a rollcall record vote upon such motion?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the situation, if the motion is adopted, as the gentleman suggests in his question, the Committee would rise and report that fact to the House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And then in the House there would be a recorded vote?

The CHAIRMAN. That is for the House to determine.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, that also, then, prevents the House from perfecting the bill and having a final vote on the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels that is hardly a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN. I believe there is an understanding that if we go back into the House and a rollcall is demanded, the rollcall will be considered tomorrow instead of today. I would like to ask the majority leader if that is not the situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct. Expressing my own personal opinion, of course, if this motion is defeated, then we can go ahead in Committee of the Whole and perfect the bill.

Mr. MARTIN. The understanding is that if we do defeat it there will not be any rollcall.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, on that I ask for tellers.

The tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. ROGERS of Texas and Mr. O'BRIEN of New York to act as tellers.

The Committee divided, and there were—ayes 144, noes 106.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose and, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, I assume, is opposed to the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further consideration of the bill be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

UNKNOWN SERVICEMEN OF WORLD WAR II AND KOREA

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make the following announcement:

Members will meet here in the House Chamber, informally, at 9:30 a. m. on tomorrow, Wednesday, May 28, 1958, and will then proceed in a body to the rotunda of the Capitol to witness the arrival of the remains of the unknown servicemen of World War II and Korea which will there lie in state until May 30, 1958.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TODAY

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the majority leader was contemplating calling up the so-called Danish claims bill at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was trying to arrange it. That is S. 2448, reported out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I thought we could use part of this afternoon in connection with that bill.

Mr. MARTIN. At least, we could adopt the rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] is here, and we can call it up, if that is agreeable. It is quite important that this bill be acted upon as quickly as possible.

Mr. MARTIN. It is agreeable to me, because that will facilitate our getting away a little earlier this week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. THORNBERY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 579, Rept. No. 1816), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12541) to promote the national defense by providing for reorganization of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the

bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

TAX REDUCTIONS

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a measure which I hope will receive thorough attention of the House Ways and Means Committee and, later, of the full House membership. This measure provides for a 50 percent cut on long term capital gains, stipulating that the increased revenues resulting be applied by the Federal Government and be earmarked for reduction of the national debt.

I am convinced that this legislation would bring substantial new revenues to the Federal Treasury, and that substantial amounts of frozen capital would be freed for investment in new and small businesses throughout the land. It would go far toward providing an incentive and a shot-in-the-arm for the national economy.

PAYMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF DENMARK

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 493 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2448) to authorize a payment to the Government of Denmark. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill S. 2448, to authorize a payment to the Government of Denmark in settlement of claims that have been in controversy for some time.

Mr. Speaker, I understand there is some controversy on the bill itself, but there was, as I remember it, no controversy on the question of granting a rule. Therefore, I reserve the balance of my time and at this time yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I, too, know of no opposition to the rule and reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2448) to authorize a payment to the Government of Denmark.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2448, with Mr. ROGERS of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes a payment to the Danish Government for 40 vessels requisitioned by the United States during the war. The amount involved is \$5,296,302, which will permit a payment to the Danish Government in full satisfaction and settlement for these ships. The United States has already paid \$35,432,350 to the Danish ship-owners.

It is possible to treat this authorization as a very technical matter. The claims of the Danish shipowners have been considered by the Court of Claims and have been the subject of prolonged negotiations with various agencies of our Government. I am not a lawyer and I would rather leave to others a discussion of the legal points involved.

From the point of view of foreign policy, I think the issue involved in this bill is a very simple one. It is primarily whether we make full payment to Denmark of claims which our Government acknowledges to be just but which because of certain legal technicalities we have not been able to pay in full.

Let me invite you to consider the situation as it was in the summer of 1941 when these Danish vessels were seized.

Denmark had been overrun by the Nazis. Thirty-eight of these ships were in United States ports; the other two arrived within a few weeks. The Danish Ambassador disregarded the instructions of his own Nazi-dominated Government and offered to the Department of State the use of these ships. The United States had not yet entered the war and there was no way in which we could requisition them at the time the offer was made. The Congress enacted legislation on June 6, 1941—Public Law 101 of the 77th Congress—which authorized the requisitioning of these vessels.

The Danish Ambassador did not insist that all details as to the compensation to be paid should be worked out in advance. No written contract or agreement was entered into. He very courageously and generously said: "You take the ships and use them in whatever way is necessary against the forces of Hitler and pay us on the same basis as you would pay owners

of United States ships under similar circumstances."

From the point of view of strictly legal considerations, we got ourselves in a difficult situation. We seized the Danish ships for title rather than for use on a charter-hire basis. It was the clear understanding of the Danish Ambassador that we would compensate for the vessels on the charter-hire basis. We took this action because of the situation which prevailed at that time.

Heavy losses of allied shipping made it important that the Danish ships be used on the North Atlantic run. The neutrality legislation prevented the use of the United States flagships on this run. Had the Danish ships been requisitioned for use they could have sailed only under the United States flag. By taking the ships for title the United States was able to arrange their charter under a foreign flag so that they could be used in the North Atlantic and render maximum service to the allied cause.

After long negotiation, in 1946 settlement contracts were entered into by the War Shipping Administration and the owners of 35 of the Danish ships, and substantial payments were made under these contracts. In 1947 a decision by the Comptroller General that further payments on the contracts would not be in accord with the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 prevented full performance of the settlement contracts. Had the ships been requisitioned for use and had the settlement been based on the use compensation standards applicable to United States-flag vessels, such an adverse decision could have been avoided.

Suits were brought in the Court of Claims by the owners of the 35 ships for which settlement contracts had been entered into and, separately, by the owners of the five other ships. A reason given for filing the suits was to prevent the claims being voided by the statute of limitations. Stipulated judgments were rendered in both suits which, on the basis of information available to the committee, did not provide adequate compensation considering the general understanding at the time of requisitioning.

The difficulties which have prevented a satisfactory settlement arise from the fact that the courts do not look to equity and justice in international relations where a claim against the United States Government is concerned; rather they apply the provisions of domestic law.

The failure of the United States to provide satisfactory settlement for the Danish ships has reached the point where it interferes with maintaining good relations with Denmark. The Danish Ambassador in 1941 took courageous action which greatly aided the allied cause without insisting on a signed contract. An important factor in our relations with Denmark is the strategic significance of Greenland.

It is important to our future relations with Denmark that we pass this bill and end controversy in regard to this matter.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is either a very simple bill or a very complicated bill.

On a simple basis, it is that we compensate the Government of Denmark for our failure to carry out an oral agreement made when these Danish ships were taken over prior to our entry into World War II. We made an agreement at that time for compensation for these ships. We agreed to compensate them on a charter-hire basis.

There has been prolonged argument between our Government and the Government of Denmark as to what is the correct amount. The matter has gone to court. Under our law one result comes out, but the Danes claim that under international law another result would come out. When it becomes complicated is, if you try to follow the admiralty law, the maritime law, the international law, that would apply to this sort of calculation.

Part of this is shown on page 4, appendix A, and on page 17 of the hearings. If you go through it, you find that the way the Danes figure it we still owe them a good bit more money than we are offering here. If you follow the way it was adjudicated in the Court of Claims, these shipowners have already been paid in full.

I think it should be borne in mind that our relations with the Government of Denmark have been most intimate and friendly through the years, going back to the time when this heroic ambassador, with possibly doubtful authority, technically, turned these ships over to our country. Our relations are close, involving the safety of what we consider the Free World down to the present time. It will be remembered that Denmark not only occupies a key place in the Baltic in our collective naval arrangements under NATO but it owns the island of Greenland, where we have bases that are of vast importance.

Therefore, because of our longtime friendly relations and the necessity for close and informal as well as formal cooperation which exists now, just as it did some years ago, our committee has reported this bill to the House. It has already been passed by the other body and we recommend that it do pass.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is not the essence of it this—that if we take a strictly legal look at the matter, under our domestic law, they cannot collect this \$5,200,000. But under international law, they can claim it and could probably get a larger judgment than this bill provides as a sort of settlement out of court? And when we consider the moral obligation and the total situation that existed then and the total situation that exists in the world now, then this is not only the right and proper thing for us to do—and our duty—it is also the wise thing to do. They cannot collect under our law, but they probably can under international law. Our officials agree that they are entitled to this amount as a matter of equity. It is only by act of Congress that we can discharge this obligation which in every sense except a strict legal sense is valid.

Mr. VORYS. I would agree with the gentleman except on the matter of the legal basis. Legally, the owners of these ships can collect no more in the United States Court of Claims under our domestic law. Legally, if these shipowners or the Government of Denmark put forth their claim based upon their method of computation in the International Court of Justice, it might be they could collect an amount substantially above this.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman I wish to speak in general terms of the validity of this claim. I happened to be in Copenhagen for 2 hours last month on my way to Moscow for a 4-day trip. Our Ambassador there impressed on me the necessity for the House to give earnest consideration to this claim. I make that reference because delicate international factors are involved, and while it would certainly not be incumbent upon us to honor a claim which was not valid and we would not be induced merely by friendship for another country to do something which in good conscience we should not be expected to do, nevertheless, there is great pressure upon our Government from the standpoint of friendship and the long relationship with a country that has been our friend and is our friend to do what they regard as justice; and nothing less than perfect justice should be done in this situation. As the gentleman from Ohio pointed out, Greenland is an integral part of Denmark. There are considerations of defense that should be weighed in determining a course which would satisfy the claims of an old and trusted friend.

Now to the merits of the case. As the gentleman from Ohio pointed out, this claim has been considered not only by the other body and passed by them, but by our Committee on Foreign Affairs. The committee was virtually unanimous in support of these claims. There were 40 ships involved, 24 of them were sunk. This represents a claim of approximately \$5 million growing out of the fact that in determining the basis for settlement, we originally took into account the fact that this was a seizure for title and not a seizure for use, although there was an informal agreement with the then Danish Minister to the United States that compensation for the use of the ships would be paid on the same basis as the compensation to which Americans would be entitled for vessels taken for use. And may I make this point very clear because I think it is the nub of the whole question. If the shipowners of Denmark receive an award for their property that is on the same basis as the shipowners of the United States received during the war period, there could be no question about the validity of this claim. In other words, this is an effort to award to the Danish shipowners an amount that would be exactly the equivalent of the award for American shipowners, since actually it was a seizure for use, though technically a seizure for title. Since the United States intended to fly other flags over these vessels, the United States not

being a participant in the war, there was a technical reason for seizure for title, but actually it was a seizure for use. I submit in all good conscience that the claim of the shipowners should be recognized.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The gentleman from Minnesota said this was illegal. Do you think it is illegal?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I did not intend to give any impression that it is illegal. I said that if we interpret our domestic law strictly, they cannot collect more in our own courts. But there is plenty of expert opinion that they could in an international court.

We must remember that the Danish Ambassador at that time, acting without the instructions of his own Nazi-controlled government, because he was anti-Nazi, indicated his understanding that the Danish Government should be compensated on the basis of hire, or use, that is, as if we had chartered them. There is also in the record evidence that there was an understanding that we would treat the Danish owners of the ships exactly as we treated the owners of privately owned American ships which were requisitioned. Whether these admitted understandings are legal claims or not, I do not know, but the fact is that we did reimburse the American owners of ships that were requisitioned, not on the basis of title, but on the basis of charter hire. I think the real point is the one just made by the gentleman from Arkansas, that we should compensate the Danish owners of these ships on exactly the same basis as we compensated American owners of ships taken later. Then no one can feel he has been treated inequitably.

There is no question but that under the dangers then facing our Government, we were glad that this Danish Ambassador acted without the orders of his Nazi-dominated Government and cooperated in our requisitioning of the Danish ships so that they would be available to us with the details to be worked out later. Actually, the United States was not at war at the time that the vessels were taken over. Here it is 20 years later and we have not cleared the matter up. I think we ought to do so at once by voting for this bill which authorizes a compromise sum, less than half the amount claimed.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yielded to the gentleman from Minnesota because he indicated that perhaps the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] had not fully understood his comment about the legality of it.

I would like to supplement what the gentleman from Minnesota has just said, to this extent: I believe this is a legal claim in international law. I further believe that if it went to the international court there would be a possibility of an adverse judgment against the United States by the world court. I feel that strict legal principles would bring a verdict in favor of the Danish

Government. But to me it would be unthinkable that we would permit any kind of legal technicalities to force the Danish Government into a court of law. There is an old maxim, and the gentleman knows it well, that while equity follows the law, there are equitable considerations lying outside the technical construction of the law. So I have referred to these equitable principles for the reason that we are dealing not on a strictly technical basis with these friends of ours who came to our assistance in a grave crisis. Then the gentleman from Minnesota makes this point: "Mr. Chairman, this is part of the cost of the war."

Just as we pay pensions to widows and other victims of even the Spanish-American War or earlier wars, and certainly the veterans of World War I receive sizeable sums of money for a war fought long ago, so we will be paying in direct or indirect ways for years to come the cost of a great war in which we were able to survive; and we survived partly because we had as allies friends like Denmark whose ambassador in this case did a brave thing and a friendly thing when he went to the offices of high officials here to make available forty ships which we desperately needed in our naval war with the German Government, even though strictly speaking, at that time we were not at war.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. The gentleman from Arkansas just made the statement that he regards this as a legal claim or legal obligation. I have read these hearings very quickly, very briefly, because the 1 day of hearings that were held was over a year ago, and my memory was not too good on them, but it seems to me Mr. Hurley representing the State Department spokesman said that our Government does not recognize this as a legal obligation and that the only obligation the State department could recognize for payment would be the existence of a moral obligation. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That might be a more precise way of putting it if we looked at it solely from the point of view of domestic law. I hope I was not guilty of a loose use of the word "legal." I would not want to make too much of the point, but what I am trying to say is that this is the kind of claim that this country should not seek to avoid payment of, although it might have a legal defense, even in international law.

I had a claim presented to me personally one time that was ruled out in the courts by a technicality in the statute because I was not consulted, but I was nominally obligated. When the claimant heard about it, he said: "Mr. Hays, I presume you do not expect to pay this." I said, "Well, I certainly do intend to pay it."

He said, "But, I could not sue you." I said, "You could not sue me, but I am going to pay this claim."

Every now and then such things happen.

If this claim were not upheld in an international tribunal, it would be only

for a technical reason. What I am trying to say is that we are not simply behaving as a good neighbor or good scout when we recognize a moral claim.

I think that since the Danish Government is now a party to this claim and would not be bound by considerations that bound the shipowners in their Court of Claims request, the Danish Government would not be technically bound by those considerations, that the claim does not come within the classification of res judicata, even though the Danish Government as claimant occupies this position for the benefit of the shipowners. I think we are legally bound to consider international law because the Court of Claims judgment was only one step in a series of steps that were necessary to get the matter before the international courts or before the Congress of the United States.

May I repeat, the sole question for the Congress to determine is this: If we wish to award compensation to the owners of the Danish ships whose vessels were taken and used by us and award the claims on the same basis that we awarded American owners, then this claim should be paid and that is all there is to it. If not, if we feel we should for one reason or another not award them the amount based on the same factors and on the same formula, then, of course, the matter should stand as it is.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I should like to ask the gentleman one question: Will the gentleman tell us if this final adjustment will be the final claim on this entire matter? Will the Danish Government repay the Danish shipowners for this?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Yes. The answer is that this is the final determination.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I would like to add that the only basis on which I will vote for it is on the moral basis, because I frankly believe that it is not a question of cost of war or what would have happened to the ships had we not taken them and used them. I am sure there would not have been any ships, and therefore the Danish Government would not have received any compensation.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Now, I am aware that courts can come up with different decisions, but what I am trying to say is that, in arguing for an equitable settlement, I am not conceding that the legal basis is lacking. That is all I intended to say. I am simply trying to be precise from the standpoint of legal reasoning. I think there is good argument on a legal basis in international law, but quite aside from that I am sure there is good argument on an equitable basis.

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PILCHER. Was not this claim about \$12 million when it first came to the committee?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. PILCHER. Now we are talking about the balance due. As far as the legal part of it is concerned, we do not owe them a dime based on all the testimony that I have heard. We paid the Danish shipowners on the basis that we pay American ships, which was much higher than the Danish rate. And, if you will notice, the Danish ambassador pleaded this case himself before our committee, but it is not the Danish Government, it is the Danish shipowners that are involved. They reworked these figures half a dozen times in order to get a balance of \$5 million. The first bill was \$12 million. It is just a matter of whether or not we think Denmark is a good enough friend that we owe it as a moral obligation. But, legally the Court of Claims has held and all the evidence we have is to the effect that we do not owe them a dime.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. The gentleman from Georgia does feel that there is a moral basis for the claim, as I understand.

Mr. PILCHER. Well, we are buying friends all over the world, if you want to put it on a moral basis. From a cold-blooded business standpoint, I do not think we owe them a dime. I think we paid more than if the ships had been operated under the Danish flag, being paid American rates. We fed them the same as we feed the men on our ships.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. There is one point that ought not to be forgotten in connection with the remarks of the gentlewoman from New York. If the Danish ambassador had not offered these 40 vessels to us, or consented to our seizure of them, we would have been in a position of seizing them illegally or of having them fighting later under the Nazi-dominated Government of Denmark against the United States. We may not be able to say that this bill is a part of the cost of the war, because we took them over before we were at war. But people could see that war was possibly coming. So our act was what might be called preemptive requisitioning, in order to keep them out of the hands of what was in fact our enemy, though not yet our legal enemy.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have only been in this House for 6 years, but if I ever saw legislation coming up with so little notice either to the Members of the House or to the members of the committee handling it, it completely escapes my memory. The single day of hearings held on this bill was on May 21, 1957, over a year ago. The bill was reported out by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on July 30, 1957. To the best of my knowledge, not a single word has been said since that time to the members of the committee, at least not to this particular member, about this bill. I did

not have any idea that this bill was going to be brought up today until I heard some remark this noon to the effect that it might come up sometime this week. And then with so little notice that there were no documents concerning the bill on the floor, and so little notice that the chairman of the subcommittee was not even on the floor when it was called up, all of a sudden, we get this bill thrust into our laps. I protest against such procedure as far as the House is concerned. I do not think this is the way to handle legislation and if for no other reason, that would adequately justify my opposition to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, basically what do we have here? We have a request from the Department of State in legislative form to make a payment to the Danish Government in the form of a gift. It is not anything else but a gift of \$5,296,302 to the Government of Denmark for full satisfaction and settlement in connection with the requisitioning of 40 vessels in 1941.

I call attention of the committee to the fact that there has already been paid to the Danish owners in this connection the sum of \$35.5 million. The question has arisen whether this is a legal obligation or whether it is a moral obligation. The point has been made, I believe by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] that if we refuse to make this settlement, the Danes might then take this to an international court and get a higher award. The point that I am making is that if this is a legal claim on the part of the Government of Denmark on behalf of its citizens, the shipowners in question, against our Government, I think the matter should go to a higher court. But to try and evade international jurisdiction by making, as I see it, nothing other than an outright gratuity to the Danish Government I do not think is the proper procedure.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call attention to one further thing. As I said earlier we had 1 single day of hearings on this very important and rather controversial piece of legislation. At that time there were a great many requests made for further information. There were a great many comments by individual members of the committee concerning whether the legislation should be rewritten, should be changed, and to the effect that the matter should be given further consideration and that we should have further hearings. And yet, as I have said, so far as I know, no action was taken until about 2 months later when the committee reported the bill out.

Mr. Chairman, I think this bill should have further study by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I think it should be more carefully considered, and above all, I think when it is brought again to the floor of the House—and I have no objection to seeing it brought to the floor of the House again, provided adequate notice is given to the membership, and to the committee, I might add—there are several points that were not covered in the hearings, that were not explained by representatives of the administration at the hearings, that should be ex-

plained. So I just object to this idea of rushing this through here with so little notice, when there are still a great many unanswered questions about the bill and even the supporters of the bill have to rely upon a year's memory in order to explain it.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'KONSKI. If this bill passes in its usual form, with only 40 Members present, is it not a fact that more than 90 percent of the Members of the House will not know what this bill is all about, authorizing an expenditure of more than \$6 million?

Mr. BENTLEY. That is quite true.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Is it not also the fact that if we make this gratuity it will open the avenue for all countries of the world who were involved in the war to ask us for more money on the ground that we have some moral obligation to pay it?

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-six Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 77]

Andersen,	Durham	Marshall
H. Carl	Engle	Morrow
Andrews	Ewins	Miller, Calif.
Ashley	Fascell	Morris
Auchincloss	Fogarty	Morrison
Bailey	Forand	Neal
Baker	Gordon	O'Hara, Minn.
Barden	Granahan	O'Neill
Barrett	Grant	Passman
Bass, Tenn.	Green, Pa.	Philbin
Boggs	Gregory	Powell
Boland	Gross	Radwan
Bosch	Gubser	Reece, Tenn.
Breeding	Gwinn	Riley
Brooks, La.	Harden	Robeson, Va.
Buckley	Hays, Ohio	Saund
Burdick	Healey	Schwengel
Byrd	Hemphill	Scott, N. C.
Carnahan	Hillings	Shelley
Celler	Hoffman	Shepherd
Chamberlain	Holifield	Shuford
Chelf	Holt	Sieminski
Christopher	Holtzman	Siler
Clark	Hull	Spence
Clevenger	Jackson	Taylor
Colmer	James	Teague, Tex.
Coudert	Jenkins	Thompson, La.
Davis, Tenn.	Kearney	Thompson, Tex.
Dawson, Ill.	Kilburn	Trimble
Dies	Kirwan	Vinson
Diggs	Latham	Watts
Dingell	LeCompte	Wier
Donohue	Lennon	Wilson, Calif.
Dowdy	McCarthy	Withrow
Doyle	Mack, Wash.	Zelenko

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROGERS of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill S. 2448, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 325 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy of my friend from Ohio in yielding me an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is unfortunate that we did not have more Members on the floor when the bill was being very ably explained by the gentleman from Ohio, the gentleman from Minnesota, and by the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill. I will try very briefly to tell the committee what is involved.

This goes back to 1941, at which time the United States Government seized and took title to, with the concurrence of the Danish ambassador, 40 Danish ships which were in United States ports at that time, to keep them out of the hands of the Germans who controlled Denmark. During the course of the war 24 of those ships were sunk. I believe 16 were returned to their owners in varying stages of seaworthiness. Of course, the Danish Government then requested compensation on behalf of the shipowners for the 24 ships that were lost. We have paid about \$35.5 million in claims to the Danish Government for those ships that were sunk.

The Government of Denmark then made an additional claim of approximately \$12 million and indicated that if that claim were not met it would take the matter to the World Court. Following negotiations between the Danish representatives and our own people, a compromise settlement of \$5,296,302 was arrived at, which is the sum authorized in this bill which has already passed the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, very briefly, as I indicated earlier, I object to the way this has been handled. In the first place, I do object strongly to having the bill brought up on the minimum notice, almost absolutely without any notice to the membership or to the members of the committee. In the second place, the State Department has stated that there is no legal obligation under domestic law for this Government to make this payment. The State Department requested, in a single day of hearings which we had, that the payment be made merely on the ground that a moral obligation existed and with the idea that if the case went to an international court, the eventual award in favor of the Danish Government might be considerably higher.

I think that if the Danish Government is due \$12 million and an international court, acting under international law found it so, in accordance with the idea that we should remunerate the owners of these vessels equally with our own people whose ships might have been used, I think we should pay it. But, very frankly, this legislation is nothing more than a gift in the nature of a compromise with the idea of avoiding the jurisdiction of international law and trying to settle the case, as I say, by way of making an outright gratuity to the Government of Denmark.

It is exactly on that principle that I object to the way it has been brought up at this time with so little notice, which rather explains why those of us on the committee find it difficult to remember all the technical details involved.

And there are a great many technical features brought out in the hearings that, so far as I can see from briefly reading the hearings, were never fully covered to the satisfaction of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I think the bill deserves further consideration by the committee, and I should hope that it will be re-committed to the committee for further study and observation.

Mr. Chairman, if any Members have any questions, although I am not a lawyer, I shall try to answer them. If there are no questions, I am glad to yield back the balance of my time to other members of the committee.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that some of our brethren were not here for the earlier discussion of this bill by the chairman of the committee and the very erudite and forceful discussion by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS]. I think for the present it might be desirable to comment on a couple of points that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] has just made. I believe the gentleman is not an attorney, and therefore he might not approach the legal part of this as some of us do. He says that this is a gratuity and that the agreement is entered into to avoid the consequences of a decision of an international court. I want to point out that this is not considered a gratuity. I read from a letter of June 11, 1957, from Under Secretary of State Christian Herter, our former colleague, to our chairman, in which he says:

I would like to emphasize that the Department does not consider the proposed payment to be a gift or gratuity but rather as an out-of-court settlement of potential international litigation.

Again, responding to questions submitted at the hearings, the State Department came back and in answer to the question, "Do we consider the proposed payment a gratuity payment?" the answer was, "We do not consider the proposed payment a gratuity payment. We consider that it is in effect an out-of-court settlement of potential international litigation."

Why should we settle? Why should we not go to court? On page 17 of the hearings, which are available at the committee desk, will be found a statement of the claims of the Government of Denmark, and a calculation by Price, Waterhouse & Co., accountants, on behalf of the Danish Embassy, setting forth the claim of Denmark in the amount of \$11,958,763. The proposed legislation would dispose of this claim for \$5,296,302.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANTANGELO. The gentleman has talked about whether this is a legal as opposed to a moral claim. The gentleman is a lawyer and I am a lawyer. Is it not a fact that the Danish owners started a lawsuit in the Court of Claims and entered into stipulations of agreement for X dollars, and have received payment in connection with that lawsuit?

Mr. VORYS. That is correct. It is all set forth in the hearings.

Mr. SANTANGELO. After they have agreed in a stipulation to receive so many dollars for their claim and have received their money, they come back through their Government, not through themselves, and say, "You owe us another \$5 million." Is that a legal claim?

Mr. VORYS. Yes, it is a legal claim in that the Danes say that under international law they are entitled to more interest and to an allowance instead of a deduction for what is known as the burden, that is, the risk involved. That is set forth in the hearings and again in the report. So that you have a situation where the shipowners tried their case in the Court of Claims, and were confronted with decisions based on our domestic law, which they say should not apply in this international situation. And remember, this was an international action, a seizure of ships by our Government while Denmark was at war. They say, "We are entitled to this under international law and are denied it under your domestic law." Therefore, this makes an international issue.

There are three reasons why we make a compromise settlement rather than submit it to an international court:

First, an international lawsuit might cost us a great deal more money than the proposed compromise settlement.

Second, the United States reputation for fair dealing might suffer if we were placed in the position of having to assert all of our possible defenses in an international lawsuit, particularly as the Danes might be able to portray our actions in this case in a light that would be very unfavorable to the United States in the eyes of world opinion.

I want to bring to the attention of the Committee the third reason why a settlement would be better than prolonging this matter by international litigation. Listen to this. This is a statement from the Department of State:

The unfortunate effect which this matter has had on United States-Danish relations over the past several years would continue and might even be magnified in the long process of international litigation.

We not only had close although somewhat informal relations with the little country of Denmark 17 years ago when this matter first arose, but those close relations involving matters of mutual security still continue and are involved in NATO, and they are involved in the strategic location of Denmark and of its possession, Greenland. Therefore, it is thought that we ought not to say, "Well, go ahead and sue us in every court." But that we ought to say, "We think what we are offering now ought to satisfy you and we hope you will take this, and if you take it that will settle it." That was the viewpoint of the position taken in the other body.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. There is this language in the report:

After long negotiation, in 1946 settlement contracts were entered into by the War Shipping Administration and the owners of 35

of the Danish ships, and substantial payments were made under these contracts.

The War Shipping Administration was the one to settle this matter. Then you go further in your report and say:

In 1947 a decision by the Comptroller General that further payments on the contracts would not be in accord with the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 * * *

So you are disregarding the War Shipping Administration settlement of war claims on vessels and you are disregarding the 1936 act, and you are just bringing out a bill from your committee to grant this much money to a claimant.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman did not read the next sentence which is of some interest. It is as follows:

The difficulties which have prevented a satisfactory settlement arise from the fact that the courts do not look to equity and justice in international relations where a claim against the United States Government is concerned; rather they apply the provisions of domestic law.

That is the controversy that still exists between us and Denmark. Every lawyer knows there is a whole body of law known as the Conflict of Laws where one nation has domestic laws that apply to a situation which are different from those of another nation applying to the same situation. You have in this area of conflict of laws matters where international law would come in. In this case the Danes say that under our domestic law they have not received just compensation, according to their domestic law, and that in this situation international law would apply their standards, not ours.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. I do not notice in your report anywhere that you give any information that you may have received from the Maritime Administration or the former War Shipping Administration or the Department of Defense. You are going into these matters one after the other of claims that might have arisen where ships were used in the war effort but were not requested by any authorized authority, is that correct?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Perhaps I can add to what the gentleman from Ohio said about the difference between domestic law and international law. It hangs on the difference between the rule applying to seizure for use and seizure for title. The gentleman from North Carolina is entirely correct in raising the question about payment under domestic law, but as the report says and I am quoting from the report:

There was no precedent for such action by the United States when we were not at war or for the action by the Danish Ambassador without the approval of his Government.

Thus the action taken had to be under seizure for title and not for use. So the gentleman raises a pertinent point only as to the domestic law and that is the reason the Court of Claims ruling has been construed as a sound judgment when it was not a sound judgment in

the usual sense of the term at all. The shipowners never at any time agreed completely that they would be fully compensated for \$35 million. They were always claiming at least the additional \$5 million. I believe that if the gentleman will read the entire report, he will find that what we are doing here is pursuing what we believe will be a legal pronouncement in an international court, and in any event and aside from what we are bound by under domestic law, we are convinced of the moral character of this claim. I should stress this as distinguished from the legal provision, for while I think it is not a strained position at all nor a faint and artificial claim that on a sound legal basis the claim might be made, I do agree it is a matter that people can argue about. But on the question of the moral basis of the claim, in my judgment there is no doubt.

Mr. BONNER. I do not mind giving the Danish Government \$5 million, if the Congress wants to give it to them and they need it, but I do not think that after this matter was taken before the War Shipping Administration and they paid for 35 of the vessels—

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Which is all they could pay for, until a final settlement was made for the other five ships.

Mr. BONNER. No. They were all in the same category.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I believe the gentleman will find the Government was ultimately paying for all 40 vessels to the extent of the domestic law, including the settlement contracts and 2 Court of Claims judgments. There were 2 different claims, 1 for 35 ships and 1 for 5 ships.

Mr. BONNER. You paid for 40 of the ships instead of 35, and now you are making an additional payment on 5 additional ships.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. No. It is not the difference between 35 and 40. It is the difference in payment under seizure for title and seizure for use for all 40 ships. The Danish Government at one time filed a claim for the additional compensation due the owners that would run to \$12 million. It could run as high as \$12 million if it became subject to a suit in an international court. So, as a matter of fact, while we feel that \$5 million is all that should be charged, if we face a case in an international court we would probably be confronted with a claim that would be \$12 million.

Mr. BONNER. What attention was paid to the Comptroller General's statement that they would be fully paid under the Merchant Marine Act of 1935?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is all that it undertook to apply—the domestic law. The Danish Government was paid all that they could be paid, but the Danish Government contends, and the State Department agrees, and the other body agreed and the House Foreign Affairs Committee agreed that that would not be the basis of the settlement; that in the light of the history of this particular claim, other principles should be applied and that the additional \$5,296,000 should be awarded.

Mr. BONNER. These ships were never requisitioned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] has expired.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BONNER. These ships were never requisitioned by the War Administration.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. These ships were taken for title, not for use.

Mr. BONNER. Well, you say in your report:

Had the ships been requisitioned, the War Administration would have settled the claims for the ships.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. May I say to the committee that this point was covered earlier when all the Members now present were not here. The essence of it is in the next sentence in the report which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] did not read in its entirety. It reads:

Had the ships been requisitioned for use and had the settlement been based on the use compensation standards applicable to United States-flag vessels, such an adverse decision could have been avoided.

This is the heart of the matter, as was pointed out earlier. Those ships were not seized originally for use, but for title, although there was an understanding with the Danish ambassador here in Washington, that compensation would be on a charter hire or use basis. Unfortunately no formal agreements were made at the time. Actually they could not be made with the Danish Government which had been taken over by the Nazis. The ambassador was acting without precedent or legal authority. So were we because we were not at war; it was after the Nazis had invaded Denmark but before Pearl Harbor. But it certainly was an act highly beneficial to ourselves and our officials agreed that there was an understanding that compensation would be on the basis of use rather than title. If there could have been a formal agreement at the time of requisitioning, the Comptroller General could have completed payments and this bill would not be necessary. The bill carries out what Senator Bailey of North Carolina urged in 1943 in discussing this matter:

It is extraordinary in the history of nations—it is, I think, without precedent in the history of this Nation—that being at peace, we should undertake to requisition or take title to ships of other nations with which we are at peace, lying in our ports (87 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 4025).

I do not think we would be expected to pay more to others than we pay to our own citizens, but I do think that we would be expected to pay to others what we pay to our own citizens.

I am not a lawyer and Senator Vandenberg was not a lawyer, but this is what he said on the matter in 1943:

When I received a personal letter from Assistant Secretary of State Berle setting down categorically the fact that this amendment does nothing more than validate the promise made by the Government of the United States to the utterly brave Danish

Minister who dared to stand out from under his home government and take the responsibility in his own hands to deliver us these 40 ships we needed, plus the delivery agreement—when I discovered that this is nothing more than a validation of our promise to the Danish Minister under those circumstances, I have no interest in what the amendment may cost. The Danish Minister is entitled to 100 percent reciprocity and good faith, in the presence of the courageous stand which he took, not only to his jeopardy, but to our everlasting advantage (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1467).

Assistant Secretary of State Berle, who had handled the matter in 1941 wrote to Senator WILEY in 1953 as follows:

It was then, and is now, my opinion that this was the least that the United States should have offered under the circumstances. It was, in fact, no more than the United States would be obligated to pay under international law, since the United States was then neutral and Denmark was a friendly country, and there was no absolute right of requisition * * *

It was not considered necessary and should not have been considered necessary by the Danish Minister to exact a written agreement that the Government of the United States would abide by international law in this matter.

It is in the light of this history and these considerations that we believe this bill should be passed.

Mr. BONNER. I see it is a decision for the House to make.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I hope the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina will let me insert this. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] did not read item 4 on page 5. It is as follows:

June 6, 1941: Public Law 101, 77th Congress, was enacted authorizing requisitioning of foreign vessels.

June to September 1941, 40 Danish vessels were requisitioned for title.

So that answers the gentleman's question, as to whether the ships were requisitioned or not.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have had a great deal of contact with the people from Denmark on this matter. They feel as deeply about this as anything about which I have ever talked to them.

I agree with the gentleman from Arkansas and the gentleman from Minnesota that this is a moral obligation; and I do trust that we will treat this great, free, and friendly people in a way that will not make them unhappy; that the House will pass this bill and let us have done with it, and please these people, because I think not only from an international standpoint but also from the standpoint of justice, right, and morals that we should pass this bill and pay this Government this money.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to pay to the Government of Denmark the sum of \$5,296,302. The payment of such sum shall constitute full satisfaction and settlement in connection with the requisition in 1941 and the use and/or loss of 40 Danish vessels during World War II by the United States.

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$5,296,302 to carry out the purpose of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROGERS of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2448) to authorize a payment to the Government of Denmark, pursuant to House Resolution 493, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BENTLEY. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BENTLEY moves that the bill be re-committed to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for further study and revision.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. BENTLEY) there were—ayes 12, noes 83.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the bill be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of no quorum.

AMENDING AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938 RE 1958 COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 12602) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit the transfer of 1958 farm acreage allotments for cotton in the case of natural disasters and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection? I wish the gentleman would not object

to this legislation; it is urgent; it is necessary that this cotton be planted. Cotton ordinarily is planted in the month of April.

The gentleman is on the Cotton Committee of the Committee on Agriculture, and I wish he would permit us to pass this bill today. It will take some little time to get the reports of the Department of Agriculture down into the field in the affected areas.

Mr. HAGEN. I have never seen the bill or the report and there is one aspect to it that I am very much interested in.

Mr. GATHINGS. The report is available on the floor today.

Mr. HAGEN. This bill was taken up in committee very hurriedly, and I never saw it myself.

Mr. GATHINGS. We did take it up in the Cotton Subcommittee, and the gentleman was present that day.

Mr. HAGEN. The bill was not present at that time.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is true. Will the gentleman withhold the objection?

Mr. HAGEN. Not at this time.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California object?

Mr. HAGEN. That is correct, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to enlarge on my reasons for objecting.

This legislation, H. R. 12602, by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], has been handled in a very extraordinary, high-handed, and unauthorized manner which I will describe. It was first presented in the form of a general proposition at a meeting of the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee on Wednesday, May 21. I say "general proposition" advisedly because copies of a specific draft of language were not available to all members of the subcommittee. In addition there was no report from the Department of Agriculture. For these reasons I unsuccessfully objected to final action on what was, at best, a very abstract proposition not embodied in legislation. Following this meeting, on the same date, the bill, H. R. 12602, was introduced—a bill which I would describe as having been illegally approved in advance of introduction.

The day following, on May 22 at 2 p. m., H. R. 12602 was acted upon favorably by a nonquorum rump group of the House Committee on Agriculture under very special circumstances.

No meeting of the whole committee for final action on this or any other bills was brought to the attention of the committee membership. It was taken up at a meeting, the notice of which read:

A meeting of the full committee has been scheduled for Thursday, May 22, 1958, at 2 p. m. in room 1310, NHOB, for consideration of the bills to extend Public Law 480. This will be an open session.

I should note that none of the House Agriculture Committee action sessions are open sessions and this is a fact which I cannot justify.

These points of disability existed against any valid action on H. R. 12602:

First. It is my understanding that the committee had been given no authority to meet during a session of the House.

Second. The notice of committee meeting was no notice with respect to action on H. R. 12602 or anything else except public consideration of bills dealing with extension of Public Law 480. In spite of this fact action was taken to approve H. R. 12602 and five other bills.

Third. Consideration of H. R. 12602 on May 22 otherwise violated House Agriculture Committee rules in that it had been irregularly approved in subcommittee and, moreover, action upon a day only 1 day following final subcommittee action violated a specific committee rule that bills from subcommittees shall lay over 3 days before final committee action.

Fourth. A quorum was not present by reason of the lack of proper notice and timing of notice and by reason of one further interesting circumstance. The action meeting on H. R. 12602 was had on the afternoon of that which could be described as a filibuster on Alaskan statehood. Five quorum calls and one recorded vote occurred shortly before and during the course of such unauthorized committee meeting. Should we suspect that a quorum was present. Most certainly not. Out of a total committee membership of 37 no more than 6 or 7 committee members were present during a decision making session.

One member noted the absence of a quorum in this combination of circumstances and raised objection to past and proposed final action on specific bills. He was informed by the committee chairman that an opportunity to reconsider these actions would be provided at a later date. This was an empty promise. No meetings of the full committee have been held since it was made; yet an effort is being made today to completely pass H. R. 12602 and a bill similarly approved passed the House last week.

In spite of the fact that I am a member of the Cotton Subcommittee and have expressed interest in this legislation, I have never been informed of an effort to pass it on the floor of the House by unanimous consent and under suspension of the rules. As a matter of fact, I have never had the bill or its report made available to me in spite of the fact that I told the committee counsel that I wanted a copy of his report when it was available. I was in a Cotton Subcommittee meeting less than an hour ago, and no mention was made of bringing this legislation to the floor in this fashion.

I submit this is a poor way to legislate.

I would also point out that no public hearings were had on this legislation and no departmental reports made available to committeemen before action. No estimates were given as to how many acres of cotton production it would add to the 1958 crop nor what the cost of those acres would be to the Federal taxpayers.

There are some doubtful instances of use of language in this bill which should be amended or clarified, and my constituents have a very personal interest in some of them.

Finally I would point out that there are those of us on and off the Committee on Agriculture who have an interest in agricultural legislation which we deem of extreme importance to our constituents and to the Nation. Yet we can get no action on our proposals except by waiting for, and paying the price of voting for some misbegotten omnibus bill. To do equity, if any agricultural legislation is to be considered singly and on its individual merit by the House Agriculture Committee and this House, all legislation should be so considered.

DANISH SHIP BILL

I. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the Danish ship bill, S. 2448.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this bill because it is in conformance with the policy of the Government of the United States to give equal treatment in the way of recompense to the owners of vessels owned by nonnationals as we give to our own owners. In this case it appears that the Danish owners did not receive the same treatment in the way of readjustments as was accorded our American owners. Thus we are making this payment to Denmark, not as a gratuity, but as a settlement in equity that we have reached in all good conscience.

What I do object to, and most strenuously, is the argument that we are making a settlement with Denmark in order to avoid a judgment against us, possibly in a much larger amount, coming from an international tribunal. I do not like my country when in equity and in good conscience it does something to be put in the position of doing the right thing merely because it is a good horse trader.

When this bill was before the Committee on Foreign Affairs I said, as will be found on page 24 of the printed hearings:

I think when we do something that is generous and gracious we should not hide our motivation behind the disguise of horse trading, that we are doing what we do because we might be sued and might lose some money. I did not agree with many of my colleagues in regard to the Anglo-American settlement. I think we did the right thing, because we wanted to do the right thing, not to avoid an imaginary lawsuit. In this matter, as I understand it, suits were started and finally a settlement was reached and this settlement was accepted by both parties to the litigation and I assume that in accepting the settlement the owners waived any other claim they might have had when they accepted this money. In the absence of fraud and coercion, or any other factors that are not present here, I cannot conceive of any court, either in law or in equity, upsetting the arrangement. It was satisfactory to everyone. There was no

coercion. There was no force. But parties agreed to it.

I then asked of the witness, the Honorable Christian A. Herter, Under Secretary of State, this question:

You will agree with me on that?

Mr. Herter replied:

Yes; the owners agreed.

I then said:

That is the reason you say you are not presenting this as a settlement of a possible lawsuit in the International Court, because you cannot. * * * I think the idea of dealing fairly with the Danish owners is something the Congress should consider, but I suggest it be considered in a little different way, making this general legislation and applying it to all in a similar position, so we then might be in the happy position of giving the same fair treatment to the owners of foreign ships that we took during the war that we gave to the American owners.

To that Under Secretary Herter replied:

I think that has been our general policy.

Mr. Speaker, no one can quarrel with policy. It is a policy that conforms to the rules of American fair play. Why we try to hide our face when we are doing something in strict conformance with the American rule of fair play by saying that we are doing it because we have to do it, because somewhere in the background is a great big boogie man with a great big imaginary lawsuit to knock us down, why we do this passeth understanding.

I read in the report of the committee on page 2 this statement:

If the United States is not able to reach a satisfactory settlement with Denmark, there remains the possibility that Denmark may take the case to an international tribunal. This might ultimately require a substantially larger payment by the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain there is nothing in the record to sustain this position. If my colleagues will turn to page 23 of the printed hearings they will find what was testified to on this score. Mr. Vorvys had asked an opinion of the Counsel of the State Department, and this statement was given by William L. Griffin, Assistant to the Legal Adviser, Department of State. This is what Mr. Griffin said:

We have not examined this case from a strictly legal point of view because it has been presented in terms of a compromise which we might be able to reach by domestic legislation. But we recognize that there is a possibility that if such a compromise settlement fails, we might then be placed in a position where we would have to examine it from the point of view that you raised.

Then Mr. VORVYS said:

Certainly you gentlemen were consulted when this matter was in the Court of Claims, were you not, under your predecessors?

And to this Mr. Griffin replied:

No, sir.

Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this bill because it represents the proper exercise of conscience and of the principles of equity by the Congress of the United States. I wish the RECORD, however, to show that I am not accepting as valid the argument that by passing

this bill we are avoiding the evil consequences of a lawsuit in an international tribunal. That is just as much poppycock in this case as it was when it was advanced as a reason for the extension of the loans of the United Kingdom.

RECENT AIR TRAGEDIES

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, recent air tragedies at Las Vegas and over West Virginia have focused the attention of the American people on the dangers of leaving uncontrolled the airspace above us. These dangers are now greatly multiplied with the advent of the newer jet planes used by the armed services. I am pleased, therefore, that the appropriate committees in the House and in the other body are making inquiries as to what controls should be imposed in the interests of safety without jeopardizing our national security.

On April 30, 1958, I addressed a letter to our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], concerning this matter. My interest was focused primarily on the Portland International Airport. This is the only airport in the Nation located near a city with a population over 250,000 where the Air Force insists on continuing its joint use with civilian planes.

Under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in my remarks a copy of my letter of April 30 to Congressman PRESTON, regarding this situation:

APRIL 30, 1958.

The Honorable PRINCE H. PRESTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee of Appropriations Committee, Department of Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESTON: In connection with your investigation of the tragic air crash at Las Vegas between a military jet plane and a civilian plane, it seemed to me appropriate to call to your attention specifically a situation existing at the Portland International Airport.

The Portland International Airport is located very close by the city of Portland, Oreg. Under a lease with the Department of the Air Force, part of it is occupied by that Department and is used for the activities of the Air National Guard, the Air Force Reserve, and by a unit of the Air Defense Command using manned interceptor aircraft. The Air Force intends shortly to replace the aircraft now there with the Century Series jet planes.

The joint civilian-military use of this airport presents not only a definite conflict in objectives but also a question of safety.

I would point out that the Air Defense Command fighter units are located at only four airfields in the United States located at cities having populations of 250,000 or more, namely: O'Hare International Airport in Chicago; the Greater Pittsburgh Airport at Pittsburgh, Pa.; the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport at Minneapolis, Minn.; and the International Airport at Portland, Oreg.

At all the other airfields other than Portland the Air Defense Command units are in the process of being moved elsewhere or, as in the case in Minneapolis, being deactivated.

This leaves Portland International Airport unique in the United States. It will be the only joint use civilian-military airport located near a large city at which an air defense command unit is located.

It is to be hoped that your committee will investigate this situation from the standpoint of the air safety factors involved.

In that connection, your attention is specifically called to the findings of the Civil Aeronautics Administration to the following effect:

"The CAA agreed that the pilot of a Century Series type aircraft on an active air defense mission is unable to see and avoid other aircraft during the climb phase of the scramble even under the best visual flight rule weather conditions because of his speed, climb altitude and preoccupation with cockpit duties. Therefore, some means had to be provided for ensuring a clear climb path for this aircraft."

This quotation is from a circular letter sent to all Regional Administrators of the Civil Aeronautics Administration under date of March 21, 1958.

Your attention is also directed to the following statement by the Regional Director of the Civil Aeronautics Administration as follows:

"Our review of this problem merely reaffirms the previous stand taken by the Civil Aeronautics Administration that the mixture of high activity military traffic, particularly ADC interceptors, with relatively high density civil operations at major terminals such as Portland, certainly is not desirable if it is at all feasible to avoid such situations. This is particularly true where weather is a prominent factor, as at Portland, where lengthy delays to both civil and military operations will inevitably result because of the scramble and recovery of these interceptors. This situation is not conducive to the normal growth or safe operation of a civil airport."

And finally I would refer you to an editorial from the February issue of the AOPA Pilot which reads in part as follows:

"This is why AOPA now says that this type of airplane can no longer 'live' safely on joint-use airports—or, for that matter, in joint-use airspace. As we see it, the only thing that will prevent catastrophe is the sharp quick eyes of the military ground-control radar operators who talk these aircraft out on their missions—and around conflicting traffic, which the fighter pilots themselves probably never use.

"First such joint-use problem in which AOPA has participated is at the Portland, Oreg., International Airport. The Air Force proposes replacing the present fighters based there with Century Series fighters. After studying the characteristics of these aircraft, and listening to detailed descriptions of how they must be handled, it is AOPA's conviction that such aircraft must be barred from any joint-use civil airport. Because these are no longer airplanes in the common definition of the term. They're manned missiles.

"And they must be treated exactly like missiles, rockets, or bullets, and confined to a restricted 'firing range.' The Department of Defense must do this now, in the interest of general public safety."

If there is any further information you desire on this matter, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely,

EDITH GREEN.

The dangers inherent in the joint use of an airport by both civilian and military planes was ably pointed out in an editorial in the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association publication Pilot for February. That editorial took note of the fact that the Century series planes should be treated as the manned missiles they are and banned from the use of air-

ports utilized by civilian planes. Under unanimous consent, I ask that the editorial be printed in full at this point in my remarks:

IS JOINT USE SAFE?

For many years AOPA has frequently and vigorously taken the position that large public airports should be open for the use of all who fly, civil and military. We now must modify that position, specifically in the case of jet fighter aircraft on the order of the Air Force's Century series fighters. This name comes from the official Air Force designation: F-100 and up. The Navy also has similar fighters.

AOPA has come to this decision with reluctance, but with an acute awareness of the hazards these aircraft create whenever they fly in airspace used by any other aircraft. It's not much of an oversimplification to say that this class of fighter becomes an unwarranted hazard in the airspace from the moment its wheels leave the runway until it rolls to a stop after landing.

Military security prevents us from discussing in detail the performance characteristics of such contemporary jet fighters as the Lockheed F-104, Convair F-102, McDonnell F-101, Chance Vought F8U, and so on. Let's just estimate that such aircraft climb at rates like 50,000 feet per minute (about 570 miles per hour straight up), and cruise as high as 1,000 miles per hour (about 16.7 miles per minute). Descent rates and maneuvering speeds are on the same order.

Just those figures alone leave no doubt in our minds but that these aircraft are physically unable to abide by the minimum standards of safety spelled out in the Civil Air Regulations. Consider: from the instant his wheels leave the ground, the pilot of such an aircraft can neither see nor avoid other aircraft. He's climbing almost straight up, so he can't see the more conventional types of aircraft flying all around him. And he's going straight up at a rate that makes it impossible for him to even see the underside of, say, a large transport airplane before flying right through it.

If this seems fantastic, consider further. The Department of Defense, speaking for all the Armed Forces, has stated publicly that the common system of air traffic control and navigation must, by 1964, serve military aircraft with a level-flight speed of 3,200 miles per hour (53.5 miles per minute, or a mile in every 1.12 seconds). By 1964, we're told, these aircraft will be changing altitude at rates as high as 100,000 feet per minute. That's about 19 miles per minute or 1,140 miles per hour straight up. They've also told us that these aircraft will operate at altitudes as high as 100,000 feet, and at landing approach speeds as high as 230 miles per hour.

These are not guided missiles, they're manned aircraft. Present-day fighters are well along toward achieving the performance goals the military say they'll have reached 6 years from now.

This is why AOPA now says that this type of airplane can no longer live safely on joint-use airports—or, for that matter, in joint-use airspace. As we see it, the only thing that will prevent catastrophe is the sharp quick eyes of the military ground-control radar operators who talk these aircraft out on their missions—and around conflicting traffic, which the fighter pilots themselves probably never see.

First such joint-use problem in which AOPA has participated is at the Portland, Oreg., International Airport. The Air Force proposes replacing the present fighters based there with Century series fighters. After studying the characteristics of these aircraft, and listening to detailed descriptions of how they must be handled, it is AOPA's conviction that such aircraft must be barred from any joint-use civil airport. Because these

are no longer airplanes in the common definition of the term. They're manned missiles.

And they must be treated exactly like missiles, rockets, or bullets, and confined to a restricted firing range. The Department of Defense must do this now, in the interest of general public safety.

Last Friday, May 23, that same association issued a statement in which it "demanded that high-performance military jets, including the Century series of fighter planes, be banned from airways altitudes and landing facilities used by civil aircraft."

The statement specifically pointed to the dangers inherent in the continued joint use of the Portland International Airport:

The first joint-use problem in which AOPA participated was in connection with the Portland, Oreg., International Airport—where the Air Force proposed replacing present fighter aircraft with Century series fighters—planes capable of cruising up to 1,000 miles, or more, per hour. Civil aviation combined in opposing this move, but the Government did nothing to prevent it.

Under unanimous consent I ask that the entire release of the AOPA be printed at this point in my remarks:

The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) today demanded that high-performance military jets, including the Century series of fighter planes, be banned from airways altitudes and landing facilities used by civil aircraft.

J. B. Hartranft, Jr., president of the 70,000-member association, in a formal statement said immediate steps must be taken to halt the needless bloodshed resulting from the operation of extra-hazardous military aircraft alongside civil airplanes.

"AOPA has warned repeatedly that this tragic loss of life will continue until effective action is taken to isolate these manned missiles from civil flying," Hartranft said. "These warnings have fallen on deaf official ears. Little action has been taken to alleviate the situation, other than the attempts to restrict further the activities of general aviation which has not been involved in the situations needing correction."

Hartranft emphasized that AOPA was not taking an antimilitary attitude. He expressed the belief that the important military segment of aviation could better perform its national defense mission if its high-speed jet aircraft were not hamstrung by civil traffic on the airways and at landing places.

"Recent military developments that have been made public have made it abundantly clear that the gap between aircraft and missiles is rapidly diminishing to the point where some advanced types of aircraft are more comparable to missiles than they are to other types of air traffic," he said. "We have no qualms about mixing military traffic with civil traffic, so long as the military traffic can be controlled and can operate under the same rules as the civil traffic."

Hartranft predicted that the situation on the airways would steadily worsen until steps were taken to keep high-performance military jets away from civil aircraft.

"The surprising thing is that there have not been more mid-air collisions," he said. "Speed of jet aircraft is constantly increasing and hazardous flying practices are continuing. Hardly a day passes but that AOPA receives one or more complaints from its members reporting they have been endangered by military aircraft—mainly jets—while flying their utility aircraft."

"The fact that three major mid-air collisions have occurred within the last 18 months should be ample warning of what

is in store for civil aviation unless remedial action is taken.

"When a fatal collision does occur, such as the recent one at Las Vegas, Nev., in which 49 persons lost their lives, the military aircraft are invariably the aggressors, primarily because they are so much faster," the AOPA president continue. "The death toll already has been terrible, and it's going to get much worse unless something is done to get these military manned missiles under control."

"AOPA's warnings and suggestions for alleviating the situation have been received with apathy. For more than a year the association has attempted to get a speed limit of 180 miles per hour written into the Civil Air Regulations for aircraft operating within an airport control zone. Thus far, any aircraft unable to get down to 180 miles per hour is not required to observe the only speed regulation on the books—and this rule applies only to high-density control zones."

"AOPA also has strongly urged that the supersonic Century series of jet fighter planes be barred from joint-use civil airports (those used by both civil and military aircraft) but this suggestion, too, failed to receive official support."

"The first joint-use problem in which AOPA participated was in connection with the Portland, Oreg., International Airport, where the Air Force proposed replacing present fighter aircraft with Century series fighters—planes capable of cruising up to 1,000 miles, or more, per hour. Civil aviation combined in opposing this move, but the Government did nothing to prevent it."

AOPA's warnings on the danger faced by civil aircraft flying in the same airspace with jets started in earnest in 1956 after a single-engine aircraft piloted by an AOPA member was rammed in midair near Midland, Tex., by an overtaking jet trainer, Hartranft said.

In a letter to the then Secretary of the Air Force, Donald A. Quarles, AOPA pointed out that the association was seriously concerned with the jet trainer collision hazard, he added.

Hartranft said, "Our letter to Mr. Quarles said in part:

"As you and your operation personnel have known for some time, AOPA has been seriously concerned with collisions and near-collisions involving Air Force and civil aircraft. We have spoken out vigorously and repeatedly about this hazard. It is AOPA's contention that most or all of these incidents are due primarily to simple carelessness. If we are to believe the newspaper accounts of this fatal collision, the very same problem is again indicated."

As an example of other protests made by AOPA, Hartranft cited an official AOPA statement issued after the midair collision of a military F-89 jet and a DC-7 airliner over California's populous San Fernando Valley early in 1957.

That statement said in part:

"The collision over the Los Angeles area once again tragically points up an aviation safety problem of serious concern to the entire aviation industry. * * * We understand only too well the shock and horror with which the people of the Los Angeles area contemplate this terrible accident. The tragedy is no less real to those of us thousands of miles from the scene; those children might have been our own. But terrible as this accident is, it appears to be just another recurrence of something all of us in civil aviation have been trying to combat for years. Military jet aircraft, by their very nature, are extra hazardous when compared with the average civil aircraft. Their performance characteristics are such as to make them a major threat to everything else in the air, unless they are rigidly restrained so that their maximum military capabilities—particularly speed—are not being used when they are being flown in airspace being used by others."

A SEPARATE IMMIGRATION QUOTA WOULD BE A GESTURE OF RECOGNITION OF ARMENIAN NATIONAL LONGINGS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, among the peoples held in the clutches of Moscow, unwillingly subject to the rule of the Kremlin, are the proud Armenians. There are some things, though admittedly not enough, that we might do to help them.

Armenia as an independent nation is one of the hapless victims of the great convulsion we know as the First World War, when empires crashed to be replaced in some instances by different empires. There are other such small nations and peoples, caught between contending powers, and the Armenians have earned a place among those who have fought for freedom even though they are deprived of the struggle's fruits.

During the years of World War I, the Armenians revolted more than once, even after a massacre of 1915, against the decadent Ottoman Empire which the Turkish people themselves later drove into the dustbin of history. The Armenians held a stronghold until on May 28, 1918, they were able to declare themselves an independent republic.

Their republic, covering areas previously controlled by Turkey and Czarist Russia, was warmly welcomed by President Woodrow Wilson and American recognition was given on April 23, 1920. The Allied Supreme Council extended recognition in the signing of the Treaty of Sevres in August of 1920. Yet in that same year the Soviet Russians came, conquered the land and proclaimed the country a republic tied to the Soviet system.

The Armenians revolted once more—in 1921—and the revolt was a success until Soviet forces were reinforced and once again established the Kremlin's mastery.

What can we in America do for these people who this year will be celebrating a day of independence but do not possess the reality of liberty?

For one thing, we can express our sympathy and interest with Armenian aspirations. There are many Americans of Armenian ancestry or birth who detest the enslavement of the land of their forefathers and are strongly anti-Communist; they would like our Government to indicate its interest in the reestablishment of an independent, democratic Armenian Republic.

For another, a simple and surely not fatal change in our domestic laws would provide for the Armenians still in their homeland a separate quota for immigration purposes. To deny them a separate quota, and incorporate their allowable migration principally in a quota designed for Turkey, is of little value to Turkey and is a deprivation for

Armenians. A separate quota would be a gesture of recognition of Armenian national longings.

TAX REDUCTION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include a letter to the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding the President of the United States announced yesterday his decision not to reduce any Federal taxes as a means of improving the general economic situation now existing in this country. I disagree with this decision. For quite some time now I have been making a very serious study of this economic recession and its resulting unemployment. From the viewpoint of trying to be helpful, I sent a letter to the President of the United States last Thursday stating my conclusions on this important matter. My general conclusion was a Federal tax reduction covering income, excise and corporate taxes was necessary to check this recession and to stimulate recovery action. Following is a copy of the letter I sent to the President:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 22, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: My purpose in writing to you is to let you know I believe an immediate reduction in Federal taxes is necessary at this time to immediately halt national recessive economic conditions and to accelerate general recovery.

It is my conclusion a reduction in personal income taxes, certain areas of excise and corporate taxes would stimulate a general economic recovery. Through this medium certain key industries and small business throughout the whole country would be greatly benefited.

Moreover, it is my conclusion that any tax reduction now should be limited as to time, in order to measure its effect upon the Nation's economy and the total national income, and to permit other long-range programs already started to have a chance to effectively set a higher and more prosperous national economy. Furthermore, a limit as to time would prevent any possibility of inflation and would discourage any marked increase in prices.

Based upon my own research as well as that of professional analyses, key indices of the national economy disclose a continuing downward trend. Although action already taken by the Federal Government to improve conditions has caused this trend to slow up and in some cases to level off, there is still lacking sufficient economic force throughout the Nation to completely halt the downward trend, and bring about immediate improvement.

All of the steps taken by the Federal Government in this crisis are sound, however, the major impact of their economic force will take effect too far in the future to bring about immediate relief so greatly necessary now for those fine citizens most urgently in need. It is for this reason I believe there

should be a total \$12 billion decrease in income taxes, excise taxes and corporate taxes, for a period extending over 2 years.

This decrease in taxes amounting to \$12 billion of purchasing power, over a period of 2 years, in the hands of the people would constitute a very effective force in correcting the immediate situation and would represent an effective intermediary force in strengthening our economy until such time as the economic impact of other longer range programs already underway or contemplated, commence to take effect.

It is to be observed that this recommended \$12-billion cut in taxes will not represent a \$12-billion decrease in the Federal income. Such a sum, constituting purchasing power in the hands of the people, will be expended for needed necessities and other goods, causing a faster absorption of inventories and thereby stimulating a demand for replenishment and new products. Because of this increase in the Nation's production processes, there will be more jobs for the people, greatly reducing unemployment. There will result an effective increase in transactions as well as in money velocity. The total national result could constitute sufficient general economic impact to cause a net increase in the national income.

In the past, during times when key economic indices disclosed evidence of economic recession, I have advocated an overall reduction in Federal taxes as the quickest method of halting such a trend. During such times I have introduced legislation into the Congress calling for the reduction of individual income and excise taxes. I believe this method of halting a recession and preventing a depression is the most immediately effective means that can be quickly employed. In addition to its economic effect, it possesses the psychological advantage of strengthening the confidence of the people and removing their fear of economic tragedy. This psychological reaction is one to be seriously considered.

It has been our experience in the United States that in time of prosperity the people do not object to paying their individual share of the Government's expenses. In a period of recession or depression, however, many of the people cannot afford the high cost of Government as well as the high cost of the necessities of life. It is during such a time the people oppose unnecessary Government expenditures and feel they should be temporarily relieved of some of their tax burdens through the process of a reduction in the costs of the Government and a direct reduction in Federal taxes covering individual income taxes, excise, and corporate taxes.

Facts indicate our Nation is now in a period of economic recession and that an immediate positive step must be taken to head off this recession and begin the processes of improvement. I believe this major step should be a reduction in the Federal individual income taxes, excise, and corporate taxes amounting to \$12 billion over the immediate 2-year period.

Assuring you such a tax reduction would have my vigorous support, I hereby recommend to you the initiation of this action. I am confident such recommended action would receive the support of the Congress.

Very sincerely yours,

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress.

The Federal tax burden in the United States has been a very heavy one for a number of years. The American people have been told this great tax burden is necessary because of crisis after crisis after crisis. Now there is a limit to the people's endurance, to patience, and to ability to pay these heavy taxes.

Many families in America today are only able to have meat once a week on their dining tables because of the high prices and the lack of money to meet these prices. Even when they do purchase this meat for a meal once a week, it is third- or fourth-class meat. This is only one example of a necessity of life. There are many other examples, such as eggs, vegetables, and other necessary foods. I say that many people in this country today are eating substandard foods, are living in substandard shelters called houses, and are wearing substandard clothing because of the lack of personal funds to do otherwise. It is a very difficult thing to be hungry and poorly clothed and poorly sheltered and to have money in your pocket and that money must be paid to the Federal Government in the form of taxes. I say this is an equity. I say it is unjust. And I say it should be corrected.

It is a very difficult thing to be unemployed and have no source of income to pay for the necessities of life. It is my view that in this great country of ours there should be enough jobs for everyone to earn their living. Unemployment is tragedy and a tragedy which should be and can be prevented. A tax reduction is needed now and would greatly stimulate economic recovery seriously necessary to this country and the economy of the Free World.

DEMOCRAT DEMAGOGUERY ON UNEMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, when I first ran for Congress, I started campaigning in November of 1949, and was elected 1 year later in November of 1950. I do not recall that unemployment was an issue during my campaign, nor was it widely discussed by Democrat spokesmen in the newspapers, nor on radio and television. Percentage-wise, unemployment for the first 4 months of 1950 was practically the same as during the first 4 months of 1958. In contrast, the conduct of my Democrat opponent and the Democrat Party in 1950 was totally different than Democrat action during the first 4 months of 1958, although the circumstances regarding unemployment were very similar.

Every legislator must have concern for the unemployed. If at all possible, we should strive for an economy which will enable any person to find a job who wants to work. It greatly distresses me to know that the miseries and heartaches caused by unemployment are a source of political advantage to those persons who so desire to make capital of human want, and willingly or unwillingly lend themselves to demagoguery.

President Eisenhower, on January 31, 1958, defined a demagog as "a person who rocks the boat himself so as to persuade everybody that there's a terrible storm on the water."

The President also defined political cassandras as persons who regularly "suggest that deep depression is just around the corner, and only panicky governmental intervention on a massive scale can stem disaster."

A search of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from January 8 through April 30, 1958, reveals that many of the Democrat spokesmen in the House and Senate seem to fit his descriptions. In these 4 months, the House and Senate Democrats have joined their voices in a loud and incessant chorus of almost daily speeches on the Republican depression, on recession, unemployment, slumps, bankruptcy, high cost of living, and the so-called hard-money policy as it influences the country's economic situation.

During the first 4 months of 1958, a total of 71 Democrats in the Congress—46 in the House of Representatives and 25 in the Senate—have participated in a seemingly well-organized attack on the Republican administration's responsibility for the economic downturn.

From January 8 through April 30, 1958, there were 214 instances of Democrat speeches or extensions of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the "gloom and doom" theme, many of them presented with an obvious lip-smacking relish for talk of disaster and decline. Certainly, the Democrats in Congress have worked hard in the last 4 months to "persuade everybody that there's a terrible storm on the water."

Here are the official figures on unemployment for the first 4 months of 1958, and for the same period of 1950, during the Democrat administration. As a means of further comparison, I am also including figures on employment and

percentages of unemployed as against the total civilian labor force.

	Civilian labor force	Employment	Unemployment	Unadjusted percentage
OLD DEFIN.				
Republican:				
Jan. 1958.....	66,732,000	62,485,000	4,256,000	6.4
Feb. 1958.....	67,160,000	62,283,000	4,888,000	7.3
Mar. 1958.....	67,510,000	62,576,000	4,933,000	7.3
Apr. 1958.....	68,027,000	63,202,000	4,835,000	7.1
Democratic:				
Jan. 1950.....	61,427,000	56,947,000	4,480,000	7.3
Feb. 1950.....	61,637,000	56,953,000	4,684,000	7.6
Mar. 1950.....	61,675,000	57,551,000	4,123,000	6.7
Apr. 1950.....	62,788,000	58,668,000	3,515,000	5.7
NEW DEFIN.				
Republican:				
Jan. 1958.....	66,732,000	62,238,000	4,494,000	6.7
Feb. 1958.....	67,160,000	61,988,000	5,173,000	7.7
Mar. 1958.....	67,510,000	62,311,000	5,198,000	7.7
Apr. 1958.....	68,027,000	62,907,000	5,120,000	7.5
Democratic:				
Jan. 1950.....	61,427,000	56,728,000	4,699,000	7.7
Feb. 1950.....	61,637,000	56,809,000	4,828,000	7.8
Mar. 1950.....	61,675,000	57,332,000	4,342,000	7.0
Apr. 1950.....	62,183,000	58,476,000	3,707,000	6.0

These figures are from the economic reports of the President, 1950, 1951, 1958, and from the Commerce Department.

In light of this, one wonders where the vociferous Democrats of 1958 were and what was occupying their attention in 1950. Just as they have been stirred to wailing and moaning over the "Republican depression" this year, so were they lulled into a complacent, do-not-worry silence regarding the economic situation in 1950.

In February 1950 when 4,684,000 persons were unemployed, with 7.6 percent of the civilian labor force out of work, President Truman, in an interview with

Arthur Krock of the New York Times, let the country know he thought that:

A certain amount of unemployment, say from three to five millions, is supportable. It is a good thing that job seeking should go on at all times; this is healthy for the economic body.

By startling contrast, in February 1958, when 4,888,000 were unemployed, with 7.3 percent of the civilian labor force out of work, Truman rushed to Washington to exhort his Democrat followers to jump on his bandwagon of wild charges, distortions, and panicky predictions of economic chaos under Republican leadership.

It is very interesting to note that very, very little was heard from Democrats in Congress on unemployment in January, February, March, or April of 1950. As a matter of fact, in those 4 months, with the percentage of unemployment almost equal to that of the same period in 1958, only nine Democrats in Congress—seven in the House of Representatives and two in the Senate—took enough interest to even mention the subject in no more than 15 separate speeches or extensions of remarks.

Research of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reveals that only six of the fifteen were wholly the speakers' thoughts, six were merely a few words of the speakers to introduce a newspaper or magazine article on the subject, and the other three were short remarks on unemployment as related to displaced persons, imports, and discussion of the appropriations bills.

The 15 Democrat speeches and extensions on unemployment and the economy from January through April 1950 are as follows:

Date	Speaker	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD page	Date	Speaker	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD page
Jan. 18, 1950	Senator Francis J. Myers (Pennsylvania).....	A379.	Apr. 4, 1950	Representative Thomas J. Lane (Massachusetts)...	4716-4718.
Jan. 31, 1950	Representative Thomas J. Lane (Massachusetts)...	A690-A691.	Do.....	Representative Henry M. Jackson (Washington)...	A2550-A2551.
Feb. 28, 1950	Representative Helen G. Douglas (California)....	A1457-A1458.	Apr. 5, 1950	Senator Pat McCarran (Nevada).....	4735-4736.
Mar. 3, 1950	Representative Thomas J. Lane (Massachusetts)...	A1620.	Do.....	Representative George Sadowski (Michigan).....	A2757.
Mar. 7, 1950	Representative George D. O'Brien (Michigan).....	A1746-A1747.	Apr. 6, 1950	Representative Henry M. Jackson (Washington)...	4923-4924.
Mar. 15, 1950	Representative Thomas J. Lane (Massachusetts)...	3431-3432.	Do.....	Representative Daniel Flood (Pennsylvania).....	4924-4925.
Mar. 23, 1950	Representative John Kennedy (Massachusetts).....	3990-3991.	Apr. 25, 1950	Representative Henry M. Jackson (Washington)...	A2999-A3001.
Mar. 27, 1950	Representative George D. O'Brien (Michigan)....	A2233.			

Compare this record of 9 Members in 15 speeches and insertions in 1950 with 71 Democrat Members in 214 speeches and insertions in 1958. There have been almost 8 times as many Democrats remarking on recession and depression in 1958—62 more, or an increase in speakers of 688.9 percent—over 1950. This year, the Democrats managed, in 4

months, to make 1,326.7 percent more noise in 14¼ times as many speeches and extensions—199 more—than in 1950.

The rising hysteria, as the Democrat spokesmen charm themselves and alarm the country with their own words, so far this year, is indicated by a monthly breakdown of the number of speeches

delivered. There were 12 speeches or insertions in January, 50 in February, 89 in March, and 63 in April 1958.

The 214 Democrat speeches and extensions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the months of January, February, March, and April 1958 are as follows:

Democrat remarks on unemployment, recession, etc., 1958

Date	Number a day	Speaker	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD page	Date	Number a day	Speaker	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD page
Jan. 8, 1958	-----	Representative Cleveland M. Bailey (West Virginia).....	A50. ¹	Jan. 27, 1958	2	Senator Wayne Morse (Oregon).....	1037.
Jan. 15, 1958	-----	Representative Ray J. Madden (Indiana).....	480.	Do.....	-----	Representative Elizabeth Kee (West Virginia).....	1124.
Jan. 16, 1958	3	Senator Hubert Humphrey (Minnesota).....	550-552.	Jan. 29, 1958	-----	Senator Richard L. Neuberger (Oregon)...	1306-1308.
Do.....	-----	Senator John Sparkman (Alabama).....	A334.	Jan. 31, 1958	-----	Senator John Sparkman (Alabama).....	1433-1435.
Do.....	-----	Representative Thos. G. Abernethy (Mississippi).....	661.	Do.....	-----	Senator Mike Mansfield (Montana).....	1435.
Jan. 20, 1958	-----	Representative John D. Dingell (Michigan).....	A416-A417.	Feb. 3, 1958	2	*Senator Paul Douglas (Illinois).....	1509.
Jan. 21, 1958	-----	Representative Abraham J. Multer (New York).....	A464.	Do.....	-----	Representative Lester Holtzman (New York).....	A980.
Jan. 23, 1958	-----	*Senator Paul Douglas (Illinois).....	A511.	Feb. 4, 1958	-----	Representative Merwin Coad (Iowa).....	A1003.
				Feb. 5, 1958	-----	Senator Albert Gore (Tennessee).....	1721.
				Feb. 6, 1958	4	Senator John Kennedy (Massachusetts)...	1809-1810.

¹Page numbers preceded by letter "A" refer to the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Democrat remarks on unemployment, recession, etc., 1958—Continued

Date	Number a day	Speaker	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD page	Date	Number a day	Speaker	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD page
Feb. 6, 1958		Senator Hubert Humphrey (Minnesota)	1822-1823.	Mar. 11, 1958		Representative Melvin Price (Illinois)	A 2234.
Do		Senator Pat McNamara (Michigan)	1827.	Do		Senator Mike Mansfield (Montana)	A 2240.
Feb. 10, 1958		Representative Charles O. Porter (Oregon)	A1230.	Do		Representative Abraham Multer (New York)	A 2282-A 2283.
Do		Representative George M. Rhodes (Pennsylvania)	A1247.	Mar. 12, 1958	3	Senator Lyndon Johnson (Texas)	4108.
Do	6	Senator Mike Mansfield (Montana)	1926.	Do		do	4128.
Do		*Senator Paul Douglas (Illinois)	1949.	Do		*Senator Paul Douglas (Illinois)	A 2289-A 2290.
Do		Representative Roy W. Wier (Minnesota)	1961.	Mar. 13, 1958	15	Representative John McCormack (Massachusetts)	4356-4360.
Do		Representative Daniel J. Flood (Pennsylvania)	1962.	Do		Representative Abraham Multer (New York)	4356-4360.
Do		Representative Lester Holtzman (New York)	1987.	Do		Representative Morgan Moulder (Missouri)	4360-4362.
Do		Representative James Roosevelt (California)	A 1212.	Do		Representative Wright Patman (Texas)	4362.
Feb. 13, 1958	7	Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney (Wyoming)	2060.	Do		Representative Lester Holtzman (New York)	4365.
Do		Senator Russell B. Long (Louisiana)	2065.	Do		Representative John Dingell (Michigan)	4365-4366.
Do		Representative LeRoy A. Anderson (Montana)	2082.	Do		Representative Coya Knutson (Minnesota)	4366-4367.
Do		Representative John McCormick (Massachusetts)	A 1258-A 1259.	Do		Representative Peter Rodino (New Jersey)	4367.
Do		Senator Estes Kefauver (Tennessee)	A 1280.	Do		Senator William Proxmire (Wisconsin)	4195.
Do		Representative Louis Rabaut (Michigan)	A 1304.	Do		Senator Alan Bible (Nevada)	4197.
Do		Representative William H. Natcher (Kentucky)	A 1320.	Do		Senator Joseph Clark (Pennsylvania)	4201.
Feb. 17, 1958	2	Senator Dennis Chavez (New Mexico)	2226-2234.	Do		Senator Hubert Humphrey	4209.
Do		Representative John D. Dingell (Michigan)	2280-2281.	Do		Senator Paul Douglas	4274.
Do		Representative Abraham J. Multer (New York)	2283.	Do		Senator John Pastore (Rhode Island)	4297.
Feb. 18, 1958	4	Representative George H. Christopher (Missouri)	2320-2322.	Do		Representative Melvin Price (Illinois)	A 2366-A 2367.
Do		Representative Elizabeth Kee (West Virginia)	2332.	Mar. 14, 1958	6	Senator William Fulbright (Arkansas)	4418.
Do		Representative Emanuel Celler (New York)	A 1459-A 1460.	Do		do	4426.
Feb. 19, 1958	4	*Senator Paul Douglas (Illinois)	A 1489-A 1490.	Do		Senator Paul Douglas	4430.
Do		Representative Elmer J. Holland (Pennsylvania)	2464-2465.	Do		Representative Charles Vanik (Ohio)	A 2384-A 2385.
Do		Representative Thomas J. Lane (Massachusetts)	A 1545-A 1546.	Do		Representative Abraham Multer (New York)	A 2418-A 2419.
Do		Representative George M. Rhodes (Pennsylvania)	A 1548-A 1549.	Mar. 17, 1958	6	Senator William Proxmire (Wisconsin)	4511.
Feb. 20, 1958	2	Senator Hubert Humphrey (Minnesota)	2496.	Do		Senator William Fulbright	4532.
Do		Senator Albert Gore (Tennessee)	A 1574-A 1575.	Do		Senator Mike Mansfield	4538.
Feb. 21, 1958	3	Senator Mike Mansfield (Montana)	2529.	Do		Representative George Christopher (Missouri)	4578.
Do		Representative Coya Knutson (Minnesota)	A 1610-A 1611.	Do		Senator Ralph Yarborough	A 2435.
Do		Representative Melvin Price (Illinois)	A 1613-A 1614.	Do		Representative Melvin Price	A 2482-A 2483.
Feb. 24, 1958	2	Representative John D. Dingell (Michigan)	2636.	Mar. 18, 1958	3	Representative Joe Evins (Tennessee)	A 2544-A 2545.
Do		Representative Barratt O'Hara (Illinois)	2636-2637.	Do		Representative Coya Knutson (Minnesota)	A 2554-A 2555.
Do		Representative John Lesinski (Michigan)	2675-2676.	Do		Representative Abraham Multer (New York)	4704.
Feb. 25, 1958	4	Representative Phillip J. Philbin (Massachusetts)	2780-2781.	Mar. 19, 1958	6	Senator William Proxmire	4719.
Do		Senator John Sparkman (Alabama)	A 1716.	Do		Senator Hubert Humphrey	4722.
Do		Representative Peter Rodino (New Jersey)	2806.	Do		Senator Lyndon Johnson	4739.
Do		Representative Abraham Multer (New York)	A 1756-A 1758.	Do		Representative Philip Philbin (Massachusetts)	4795.
Feb. 26, 1958	4	Senator Hubert Humphrey (Minnesota)	2835.	Do		Representative Peter Rodino (New York)	4816.
Do		Senator Wayne Morse (Oregon)	2879-2880.	Do		Representative John Shelley (California)	A 2583-A 2584.
Do		Senator John Sparkman	A 1782-A 1783.	Mar. 20, 1958	1	Representative Thomas J. Lane (Massachusetts)	4946.
Do		Senator William E. Proxmire (Wisconsin)	A 1782.	Mar. 21, 1958	1	Senator Lyndon Johnson	4972.
Feb. 27, 1958	2	Representative Harley Staggers (West Virginia)	3069.	Mar. 24, 1958	6	Senator Joseph O'Mahoney (Wyoming)	5075.
Mar. 3, 1958		Representative Melvin Price (Illinois)	A 1914-A 1915.	Do		Senator Ralph Yarborough	5086.
Mar. 5, 1958	3	Representative Abraham Multer (New York)	3498.	Do		Senator Harry Byrd (Virginia)	5089.
Do		Representative Coya Knutson (Minnesota)	A 2062-A 2063.	Do		Senator William Proxmire	5092.
Do		Representative John D. Dingell (Michigan)	A 2063-A 2064.	Mar. 25, 1958	3	Senator Hubert Humphrey	5112.
Mar. 6, 1958	13	Senator Lyndon Johnson (Texas)	3509-3511.	Do		Senator William Proxmire	5189.
Do		Senator Mike Mansfield (Montana)	3510.	Do		Representative Robert Sikes (Florida)	5258.
Do		Senator Ralph Yarborough (Texas)	3517-3518.	Mar. 27, 1958	4	Representative Abraham Multer	A 2794-A 2797.
Do		Senator John Kennedy (Massachusetts)	3543.	Do		Senator Olin Johnston (South Carolina)	5584.
Do		Senator Hubert Humphrey (Minnesota)	3564.	Do		Senator John Kennedy	5595.
Do		Senator James E. Murray (Montana)	3564.	Do		Representative Hugh Addonizio (New Jersey)	5654.
Do		Senator Lyndon Johnson (Texas)	3569.	Do		Representative Peter Rodino	5658.
Do		Senator Hubert Humphrey (Minnesota)	3578.	Apr. 1, 1958	6	Senator Mike Mansfield	5887.
Do		Senator Wayne Morse (Oregon)	3582.	Do		Senator William Proxmire	5892.
Do		do	3590.	Do		do	A 3075.
Do		Senator Paul Douglas (Illinois)	3596.	Apr. 2, 1958	5	Representative Abraham Multer	A 3111.
Do		Representative Carl Perkins (Kentucky)	3638.	Do		Representative Thomas Lane	A 3126-A 3127.
Do		Representative Peter Mack (Illinois)	A 2108.	Do		Representative J. Floyd Breeding (Kansas)	A 3127.
Mar. 10, 1958	7	Representative John E. Fogarty (Rhode Island)	3822.	Do		Senator William Proxmire	6065.
Do		Senator Lyndon Johnson (Texas)	3664.	Do		Senator Hubert Humphrey	6070.
Do		Senator Richard Neuberger (Oregon)	3689.	Do		Senator Wayne Morse	6093.
Do		Senator Estes Kefauver (Tennessee)	3710.	Do		Representative John Flynt (Georgia)	6152.
Do		Senator Joseph O'Mahoney (Wyoming)	3713.	Do		Senator John Sparkman	A 3178-A 3179.
Do		*Senator Paul Douglas (Illinois)	3774.	Apr. 3, 1958	3	Senator William Proxmire	6199.
Do		Senator John Sparkman (Alabama)	A 2163.	Do		Representative Ray Madden	6258.
Mar. 11, 1958	12	Representative William A. Barrett (Pennsylvania)	4085.	Do		Representative Harold Donohue (Massachusetts)	6273.
Do		Representative John McCormack (Massachusetts)	4088.	Apr. 14, 1958	6	*Senator Paul Douglas	A 3284.
Do		Representative Wilbur D. Mills (Arkansas)	4089.	Do		Representative Elmer Holland (Pennsylvania)	A 3296.
Do		Representative Carl Albert (Oklahoma)	4039.	Do		*Senator Paul Douglas	A 3296-A 3297.
Do		*Senator Paul Douglas (Illinois)	3895-3901.	Do		Representative George Rhodes	A 3299-A 3300.
Do		Senator Pat McNamara (Michigan)	3895-3901.	Do		Representative Daniel Flood	A 3301-A 3302.
Do		Senator John Sparkman (Alabama)	3895-3901.	Apr. 15, 1958	12	Senator William Proxmire	6359.
Do		Senator Estes Kefauver (Tennessee)	3911.	Do		do	6362.
Do		Senator Hubert Humphrey (Minnesota)	3962.	Do		Senator Hubert Humphrey	6381.
Do		do	3962.	Do		Senator Wayne Morse	6432.
				Do		Representative Wright Patman	6449.
				Do		Representative Ed Edmondson (Oklahoma)	6454.
				Do		Senator Estes Kefauver	6464.
				Do		Representative Eugene McCarthy (Minnesota)	6465.
				Do		do	
				Do		Representative John Dingell	6473.
				Do		do	A 3367-A 3368.
				Do		Representative J. Floyd Breeding	A 3370.
				Apr. 16, 1958	7	Senator Stuart Symington (Missouri)	6489.
				Do		Senator William Proxmire	6489.

Democrat remarks on unemployment, recession, etc., 1958—Continued

Date	Number a day	Speaker	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD page	Date	Number a day	Speaker	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD page
Apr. 16, 1958		*Senator Paul Douglas	6497.	Apr. 22, 1958		Representative Coya Knutson	6965.
Do		Representative Thomas Ashley (Ohio)	6578.	Apr. 23, 1958	7	*Senator Paul Douglas	7003.
Do		Representative John Dingell	6578.	Do		Senator William Proxmire	7008.
Do		Senator Proxmire	A3391.	Do		Senator Joseph Clark	7007.
Do		Representative Thomas Lane	A3391-A3406.	Do		Senator Ralph Yarborough	7020.
Apr. 17, 1958	1	Representative Peter Mack (Illinois)	A3495.	Do		Senator James Murray	A3655.
Apr. 21, 1958	5	Senator Mike Mansfield	6739.	Do		Representative Thomas Lane	A3673.
Do		Senator William Proxmire	6761.	Do		Representative Robert Sikes	A3700-A3701.
Do		Senator Lyndon Johnson	6761.	Apr. 24, 1958	3	Senator John Sparkman	7229.
Do		*Senator Paul Douglas	6774.	Apr. 26, 1958		*Senator Paul Douglas	7400.
Do		*do	A3511.	Do		Senator William Proxmire	A3791.
Apr. 22, 1958	7	Senator Hubert Humphrey	6875.	Apr. 28, 1958	3	do	7445.
Do		Senator Ralph Yarborough	6878.	Do		Senator John Kennedy	A3801.
Do		Senator Hubert Humphrey	6906.	Do		Senator George Smathers (Florida)	A3807.
Do		Senator William Proxmire	A3590-A3591.	Apr. 29, 1958	1	Senator Hubert Humphrey	7597.
Do		Representative Merwin Good	A3620.	Apr. 30, 1958	1	Representative Ray Madden	7744.

On April 6, 1950, after 3 months of high unemployment, President Truman presented to the Congress his remedy for the situation—a message recommending that the unemployment insurance benefits be extended to 6 million workers not already covered, including workers in small firms and Federal Government civilian employees. However, the Democrat-controlled 81st Congress took no action on Truman's recommendations.

In fact, it is the Republican 83d Congress who should be given credit for enlarging coverage of the much needed unemployment insurance legislation. The Republicans extended benefits to Federal Government civilian employees. The Republicans brought thousands of additional small firms under this coverage, reducing the eligibility requirement in the number of employees from 8 or more to 4 or more. The Republicans also set up an \$8 billion reserve fund of unemployment compensation benefits on which the States could draw.

In contrast to the halfhearted attempts of the Democrats to relieve unemployment in 1950, let me review the Republican record in 1957 and 1958—a record of specific actions and recommendations designed to stimulate the economy. Proof of this is shown in 50 separate moves on the part of the Republicans up to March 30, 1958. It has not taken 3 months of staring at high unemployment figures for the Republicans to get started as was the case in 1950 when President Truman faced the same situation.

The Republican actions and program to stimulate the economy and help employment through March 30, 1958, are:

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

First. Defense contracts accelerated to \$13.4 billion in first half of 1958 as against \$7.9 billion in last half of 1957. Calendar year totals: 1958—\$23.6 billion; 1957—\$17.8 billion.

Second. Spending increased in Federal highway programs by \$800 million over last fiscal year and plans call for additional increase of \$600 million in fiscal 1959.

Third. Acceleration of authorized civil works by \$200 million in current fiscal year.

Fourth. Federal Reserve discount rate reduced from 3½ to 3 percent on November 14.

Fifth. Reserve requirement of Federal Reserve banks reduced one-half of 1 per-

cent on February 20, thereby freeing additional \$3 billion for lending.

Sixth. Release of \$107 million for additional purchase of military Capehart housing loans by Federal National Mortgage Association.

Seventh. Additional \$50 million in capital grant funds for urban renewal projects issued.

Eighth. FNMA received additional \$20 million for purchase of FHA insured loans for cooperative housing.

Ninth. FHA-insured mortgage downpayments reduced.

Tenth. Release of additional \$200 million for use in FNMA's special assistance mortgage-buying program.

Eleventh. About 60 Federal buildings programed for lease-purchase construction, requiring \$105 million financing. If ordered by Congress for financing by direct appropriations \$177 million would be appropriated.

Twelfth. Federal Reserve discount rate cut from 3 to 2¾ percent on January 21.

Thirteenth. Rule requiring cash payment of FHA closing costs eliminated, in effect a further reduction of down payment requirement.

Fourteenth. More funds attracted to VA-insured mortgages by permitting increase in maximum yields allowed on VA loans traded in secondary markets.

Fifteenth. Defense Department directed to funnel contracts to distressed labor areas and to small business generally. In February, \$102 million in Federal contracts set aside for small business, twice the amount in February 1957.

Sixteenth. Federal Home Loan Bank Board arranged longer term financing with home loan banks.

Seventeenth. Army schedules award of \$100 million in motor vehicle contracts in areas hit by automobile unemployment.

Eighteenth. Speedup ordered in \$1 billion worth of urban renewal loans and grants handled by Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Nineteenth. Federal Reserve discount rate dropped from 2¾ to 2½ percent on March 6.

Twentieth. Acceleration ordered in placement of \$740 million in Rural Electrification Administration loans for electric facilities and telephones.

Twenty-first. Federal Reserve again reduces reserve requirement by one-half

of 1 percent on March 18, freeing another \$3 billion for lending.

Twenty-second. President orders speedup in \$300 million in HHFA loans for college housing.

Twenty-third. Urban renewal program speeded to 100 new projects in fiscal 1958 and 120 additional in fiscal 1959, compared to 56 started in fiscal 1957.

Twenty-fourth. Military departments accelerate construction programed before June 30 to total of more than \$2 billion and expect to arrange financing for \$500 million in Capehart housing loans. All Federal agencies directed to plan immediately for as many fiscal 1958 supply and equipment orders as possible.

Twenty-fifth. Interior Department steps up general construction program by \$25 million.

Twenty-sixth. Acceleration ordered on \$140 million in HHFA public housing loans.

Twenty-seventh. General Services Administration given extra \$8 million for general repair and improvement work.

Twenty-eighth. REA given additional \$12.5 million for loans.

Twenty-ninth. Speedup ordered on \$75 million in HHFA loans for public facilities.

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

Thirtieth. Permit Federal Government to assist States in 50 percent extension of unemployment benefits.

Thirty-first. General supplemental appropriations of \$1.2 billion, mostly for defense, requested.

Thirty-second. Congress asked to authorize \$2 billion, 3-year program of post office modernization and construction.

Thirty-third. Area assistance program recommended for Federal aid to sections of the country experiencing persistent unemployment.

Thirty-fourth. Additional \$200 million requested for accelerated urban renewal program in year beginning July 1.

Thirty-fifth. Army Engineers' fiscal 1959 budget for civil works boosted by \$125 million.

Thirty-sixth. Congress asked to remove limit on life of Small Business Administration.

Thirty-seventh. A \$2 billion increase in lending authority of Export-Import Bank requested. Bank to finance \$625 million in shipments abroad in first half of 1958 with larger program due in last half of this year.

Thirty-eighth. Congress requested to authorize \$840 million speedup in general Government purchasing by June.

Thirty-ninth. Congress asked to suspend expenditure limitations in Highway Act, so that additional \$2.2 billion can be allocated for highway aid in calendar years 1958-1961.

Fortieth. Reclamation Bureau's 1959 budget increased by \$46 million to maintain faster construction pace.

Forty-first. Congress asked to increase size of FHA loan insurance and to increase FHA total loan authorization by \$3 billion per year for next 5 fiscal years.

Forty-second. Tax relief for small business proposed.

Forty-third. Acceleration of VA home loan program proposed through elimination of interest rate limitation.

Forty-fourth. Congress asked for additional \$15 million for Agriculture Department watershed program in fiscal 1959.

Forty-fifth. Supplemental appropriation of \$46 million for Federal hospital aid proposed.

Forty-sixth. Congress asked for \$2 million supplemental appropriation for FHA to use in speeding processing of loan applications.

Forty-seventh. District of Columbia authorized to propose \$100 million public works program, to be financed with Treasury borrowings.

Forty-eighth. Elimination asked of interest-rate limitation on FHA-insured loans for rental projects, cooperative housing and Capehart military housing.

Forty-ninth. Interior Department budget amended to permit early start on small reclamation projects.

Fiftieth. Additional lending authority proposed for Small Business Administration.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. I want to compliment the gentleman from Illinois on his very fine and factual statement. Certainly no one can refute the figures that have been taken from the record. The statements are clear and concise, and prove the fact that the Democratic Party whether it is in the House or outside the Congress always wants to take the part of gloom and doom and place the blame anywhere except on their own shoulders.

Let me call attention to something that has a little relation to the present situation about which the gentleman is speaking. In the Herald-Tribune of Sunday there was an article on the front page with this heading:

FRENCH CRISIS MAY CANCEL TRUMAN TRIP

The situation in France may keep former President Harry S. Truman and Mrs. Truman from sailing tomorrow on the liner *Independence* for a month's vacation in Europe. On his arrival from Kansas City yesterday, he said:

"I hope the disastrous situation in France doesn't get any worse, because if it does, we may have to change our plans. Sometimes I think France is about to fall to pieces."

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this has a great deal of bearing on what happens to

our foreign policy, when people who are in high places in our country make statements of that kind. Just how can our administration keep a firm footing with people abroad when a former President of the United States makes a statement of that kind.

Mr. Speaker, I say now to the gentleman from Illinois, this is an example of just what happens with the Democratic Party when they open their mouths on this type of relation.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. I compliment the gentleman from Illinois most highly on the way he has expressed this situation and how he has documented it. It reveals considerable and sound thinking.

As a response to the quotation from the distinguished ex-President, the answer to his remark at that time is that today he says this:

There are those who have been saying that a little recession is a good thing for the health of our economy. They would like you to believe that a temporary curb of prosperity is the way to halt runaway inflation. This kind of thinking is like believing a little bit of war might be beneficial.

Also, in 1949, the Americans for Democratic action said:

We are now in no immediate economic emergency which would make it necessary for us to rush pellmell into an improvised program of action that discarded longer range consideration.

What do they say today?

If this recession were allowed to run its natural course, this would cause further needless human suffering and cost the whole country additional billions.

This was on February 12 in a statement urging a crash program of 10 New Dealish spending plans. I think that might supplement the gentleman's very able statement and I thank him for yielding to me.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I thank the gentleman from California. That is, as he so well put it, the point I tried to make here. We all, Democrats and Republicans, must be concerned with unemployment and do everything we can to help people who are unemployed. Yet it often strikes me as very peculiar that too much politics is played with unemployment. In other words, if we do have unemployment, which we do at the present time, all of us should lend our shoulder to the wheel and not cover up and refuse to face the facts. That is one of the reasons I tried to bring these facts to the attention of the Congress; because in the same 4-month period, comparably speaking in 1950 and 1953, the only difference in my estimation is the fact that the Republicans are in now and the Democrats were in 1950; and the Democrats, if they were realistic and really wanted to take care of the unemployed, should have been just as much concerned and should have made as many speeches in 1950 as they are making in 1953.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield.

Mr. McVEY. I want to join my colleagues in expressing our appreciation for this very fine statement on the part of our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois. His statement gives us complete statistics on a most important subject. I am sure we all appreciate it and commend the gentleman on his excellent presentation.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. Like my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY], I feel always that many of us in the well of the House stand up here and make charges, and I do not mind making charges when I can support them with facts whenever I attempt to say anything about any of my Democratic friends, and I try not specifically to single out an individual, but I try to back up the record with such statistics and facts as we are able to get and present in a really effectual manner.

COMBAT STRENGTH AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned with the progressive dilution of the combat strength and combat effectiveness of the United States Army. I am deeply concerned because I believe we see before us, for fiscal year 1959, a simple continuation of a trend which started after the Korean war. Reductions in our Armed Forces at that time were understandable. However, we have reached a point where the cumulative effects of these reductions in the Army strength and effectiveness, continued year after year, now constitute a vital deficiency in our national defense posture.

The proposed strength of only 870,000 men for our Army is not adequate to meet minimum requirements for world conditions today. The calculated risk is too great to accept. This proposed strength of 870,000 was not concurred in by the Joint Chiefs of Staff; it is a strength figure which was dictated by purely fiscal considerations, overriding the professional convictions and objections of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of the Army, and the Army Chief of Staff. The strength which the Army must have to meet its responsibilities in the world today is at least 900,000 men and the necessary funds to support them.

Now, why is this so?

Today the Soviet threat remains as great, if not greater than ever before. We need only to look at last week's headlines, the present international tensions, the Soviet missile successes, the insidious Communist penetration in the Middle East, and South and Central America, and the modernization and improvement of the Soviet Army since World War II. The Soviet Union has a military strength in excess of 4 million men, including an

army of the strength of 2½ million. The Soviet Army has greatly increased its mobility and firepower, having received a new family of army missiles, new artillery and small arms, new combat vehicles, including armored personnel carriers, medium tanks, amphibious vehicles, and helicopters. Add to these the capability for both large and small nuclear weapons, which from all indications the Soviets have, and we indeed are confronted with a formidable threat—I am sure there is none among you who would contend that the Russian pattern is one for peace. Also, we must not overlook either, the combined strength of the North Korean and Chinese Communist Armies of 2½ million men. Even though the Chinese Communists have announced their intention to withdraw their forces from North Korea, they retain the capability of rapidly reentering Korea, or of being committed in other possible areas of Asia.

I regard it as particularly significant that the Russians and their satellites, while developing their nuclear and missile capabilities for a general war, have assigned a very high priority to developing the means to pursue their objective of world domination by means and methods short of a general nuclear war. It thus now is generally accepted that while a general war with massive nuclear blows and counterblows constitutes the greater risk, of course, to our Nation's survival if it should occur, it is the least likely threat, as the ability to deliver blows and counterblows on both sides is approaching a state of balance. The most probable course the Russians and the satellites will pursue is one to infiltrate, subvert, and, where necessary to avoid delays in their timetable for world domination, initiate local aggression.

The principal responsibilities of the Army may be summarized as: First, the maintenance of overseas forces for deterrence of aggression or for the effective resistance to aggression if deterrence fails; second, the maintenance of a mobile combat-ready strategic force at home for the rapid reinforcement of forward deployed forces or for the prompt suppression of other local aggressions; and third, the contribution of Army forces as required for the defense of the United States against air attack.

Of these responsibilities, it is the progressive impairment of the Army ability to stop local aggressions which causes me genuine concern. Our growing inability to move swiftly and decisively to stop local aggressions may well prove to be the Achilles heel of our United States defense effort. Our constantly declining capability to respond to calls for help from small allied nations or small neutral nations will have a tremendous psychological impact upon other straddle-the-fence nations. Such failure on our part will weaken political, military, and cultural ties between the United States and existing and potential allies. The distinctive feature of this type of limited war is that its outcome does not involve, or seem to involve, our national survival directly. It is for this reason, perhaps, that we have failed to appreciate the

significance of remaining prepared to counter such local aggressions.

While stopping local aggressions is a responsibility of all three services, this responsibility falls most heavily upon the Army—and this is the reason for my concern, and the reason for my speaking on this subject today. Continued reduction in Army forces, both in the Ready Forces in the United States, as well as in our overseas forces, invites expansion, coups, and renewed aggression, on the part of the Communist bloc.

The Army has been reduced from an active strength of over 1.4 million men at the beginning of fiscal year 1955 to a proposed 870,000 by the end of fiscal year 1959, and the number of active divisions has decreased from 20 to 14 during that time. The reduction in strength to 870,000 as proposed in the fiscal year 1959 Army budget will curtail during the next year, the combat capability of our forces in Europe and in Korea, and will reduce the number of divisions in the United States that are ready for combat. Of the 6 divisions then remaining in the United States, only 3 would be available for early deployment. The other three divisions will be heavily involved in the training of replacements and of our Reserve component 6-month trainees.

The active Army cannot be considered alone. The Reserve Forces have always constituted a strength backup to our relatively small active Army. These Reserve Forces must be adequately trained and prepared for early entry into combat. The National Guard now has a strength of over 400,000 men. I have heard no sound reason advanced to justify reduction below that number. In 1955 the Congress passed the Reserve Forces Act to improve the readiness of the Reserves. The strength of the Army Reserves, in my opinion, should not be permitted to fall below the 300,000 paid drill strength planned for the end of fiscal year 1959. These Reserve units, as well as our active Army units, must be highly trained, fully equipped, and capable of winning on the battlefield of the future with no unnecessary casualties.

We must not lose sight of the fact that the National Guard and the Army Reserve depend upon the active Army for training support. Reduction of the active Army to 870,000 means a reduction in its capability to provide that training support to a Guard and Reserve force of 700,000. There would be a deficit of some 6,000-7,000 trainers which the active Army must, nevertheless, provide for the training support of a 700,000 Reserve Force. Many of these trainers would have to be drawn from active Army divisions. It is not difficult to see that this would further reduce the combat effectiveness of our Ready Forces.

Army overseas forces constitute our first line of defense—a shield—with the mission of deterring aggression in the important strategic areas where they stand guard. The effectiveness of this deterrent has been shown by the lack of any act of aggression on the part of Soviet bloc nations in areas where

United States Army forces have been deployed. These forces must be strong enough to convince our allies of our will and ability to resist aggressions, and to convince our enemies that a forward movement in these strategic areas will be blocked on the ground long enough to allow time for reinforcement and for the application of our full military power, if necessary. Any reduction in the personnel strength of these overseas deployments will weaken our ability to counter local aggression or to carry out the initial tasks of general war, and it may result in the sacrifice of the few United States Army troops remaining.

In some cases, our overseas units are being maintained on paper by borrowing local soldiers. For example, in the United States Army forces in Korea, about 15,000 Korean troops must be used to fill up United States combat units which could not otherwise be kept at full strength.

I sincerely believe we must have an active Army of at least 900,000 including 15 divisions, which are well equipped with modern weapons and the latest equipment, and a 700,000 paid drill Reserve Force structure with units equipped and organized exactly the same as our active units. A portion of this 30,000-man active Army increase over the budget strength of 870,000 would allow the Army some flexibility to make required adjustments in overseas forces. Specifically, Army forces in the Pacific area would be augmented by an increased number of combat and logistical support units. United States personnel would replace some of the 15,000 Korean troops now assigned to United States divisions, thereby improving the combat capability of these divisions. Army forces in Europe would be augmented to increase our combat capability.

A major portion of the additional 30,000 personnel would be allocated to the Ready Forces in the United States and eliminate the need to inactivate another Army division.

Some of the additional personnel would be utilized to accommodate an increase in training, including an increase in active Army personnel available to train a 700,000 paid drill force of the Reserve components.

The additional cost of retaining an active Army of 900,000 rather than the reduction proposed in the budget will be \$99 million—rather than the \$84 million previously mentioned—\$45 million for military personnel, Army, \$39 million for operations and maintenance, and approximately \$15 million for procurement of equipment and missiles, Army—to replace consumption and wear-out during fiscal year 1959 by these additional 30,000 troops. I am not unmindful of our national debt, and the effect of \$99 million upon the economy of the country. However, I believe that this additional security is something which we cannot afford to be without.

This increase in strength is only part of having a most effective ground force; these troops should be equipped with the most modern items of warfare which our scientific and industrial know-how can make available. The above cost

does not include funds for this modernization; however, I am primarily interested, at this time, in arresting the continuous reductions in our Army strength. An authorized strength of 900,000 and an additional \$99 million will halt this reduction.

I would like to summarize the salient points which deeply concern me and should be of concern to all who have the responsibility for the security of this Nation:

First. International tension is increasing: the Soviet's Army of 2½ million men is being modernized at an unprecedented rate, and the Soviet threat is as great, if not greater, than in the past.

Second. A strength of 870,000 for our Army is not adequate. The assigned missions and commitments of our Army have not changed, nor have the Joint Chiefs of Staff approved an 870,000 Army force structure.

Third. The gradual erosion of the Free World position through piecemeal local aggression around the periphery of the West has become the most probable immediate threat to the security of the Nation.

Fourth. The Army has been cut from 20 divisions to 14 divisions since 1955, and is now on such an austere basis that it is doubtful that our deployed forces could effectively operate in sustained combat, or that our reinforcing units could rapidly and decisively move to and contain Communist local aggressions such as Korea.

Fifth. The minimum acceptable means to stop these trends is, in my opinion, a 900,000-man Army of 15 divisions and a 700,000 paid-drill Reserve Force structure with all active and reserve units well equipped with modern weapons and the latest equipment.

Sixth. The additional cost of maintaining the strength of the active Army at 900,000 for fiscal year 1959 is about \$99 million, a small price to pay for the greatly improved effectiveness of our military organization, which already is spread too thin in view of our worldwide commitments.

ONE THING IS CERTAIN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, everyone except Mr. Dulles seems agreed that we need to reappraise and to alter our policies toward Latin America.

Senator SMATHERS, who has long had an informed and sympathetic interest in Latin America, has said this for at least 4 years. On May 14, 1958, he said in the other body:

One thing is certain, Mr. President, namely, that the demonstrations show the urgent need for a reappraisal of our policies toward Latin America. To dismiss as merely the handiwork of the Communists the bitter reception accorded the Vice President at various places which he has visited in the course of his trip is to ignore the realities of the day.

Another experienced and able observer of the Latin American scene is Serafino

Romualdi, AFL-CIO Inter-American Representative who joined Vice President Nixon as a member of the United States delegation to the recent inauguration of Argentina's new president, Arturo Frondizi. In the AFL-CIO News, May 24, 1958, he wrote:

One thing is certain—all are now agreed that a thoroughgoing review of the relationship of the United States with Latin America is needed. This must be undertaken promptly with a determination to explore the sources of the grievances and misunderstandings of our neighbors to the south and with an equal determination on both sides to take deep-rooted, lasting corrective measures.

It is clear that one thing is certain: a reappraisal is needed and changes are bound to result. What is not certain, Mr. Speaker, is whether Mr. NIXON will be of much help. Senator MORSE's committee in the other body will soon begin its study. It is likely that our own Foreign Affairs Committee will presently launch its own review and that delegations from both Houses of Congress will visit Latin America this fall.

But how do we change administration policy in accordance with the urgencies of the situation? There is only one way. Mr. NIXON, who could also help persuade his party affiliates in the House to support the Reciprocal Trade Agreements bill, can persuade the President and the Secretary of State. Our capable colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], said May 13, 1958:

Developments in Latin America point up the necessity for passing this bill better than any arguments that I can advance.

Will our Vice President prevail over Mr. Dulles? Will he try to convince his Republican friends in the House to heed the lessons he learned in Latin America? He has said he would. I hope he will, but I can see reasons why there may be doubts that he will. I set them forth here so that he may, if he should see fit, reassure the many persons in this hemisphere whose hopes are high that he will follow through.

Of course I am prejudiced about Mr. NIXON. I am among those who were not satisfied with his explanation of his fund. I am among those who deeply resented his campaigns against Jerry Voorhees and Helen Gahagan Douglas and his use of the same smear techniques in national campaigns. The use of disloyalty implications in political discussions has been privately, so we are told, dismissed by the Vice President as a sin of his youth. Many of us would feel better if the repentance had been public. But today I shall confine my remarks to Latin America and actions of the Vice President during and after his Latin American good-will tour.

Mr. NIXON has returned from his sorry experiences in South America with some decisive recommendation regarding our Latin American policy.

On the first leg of his trip, in Uruguay and Argentina, he met the wave of criticism of United States policy toward hemisphere dictators by echoing the old State Department line. Mr. Nixon told

his critical audiences that any expression of opinion by us regarding dictatorships in Latin America would constitute intervention.

By the time Mr. Nixon reached Peru he seems to have wavered from that conviction, despite the battery of high-powered advisers at his elbow. Since his arrival back home, his parting of the way with the State Department has been outspoken and unequivocal.

MR. NIXON'S DISCOVERIES

Mr. NIXON seems to have discovered the real South America. He found a continent in ferment and a people yearning for freedom. He found the Communists on hand ready to identify themselves with the burning aspirations of the populace. Where are we in the picture? Ironically, the Vice President found the United States, supposed leader of the Free World and defender of human rights, identified in the popular mind with brutal dictatorships and old-style dollar diplomacy.

I cannot, of course, speak for Mr. NIXON. His own statements, however, are on record. At the National Press Club luncheon last week, he cautioned against a comfortable dismissal of the violence he encountered as solely the work of the Communists. In Mr. Nixon's own words: "While it is true that Communists spearheaded the attacks, they had a lot of willing spear carriers with them."

MR. NIXON'S RECOMMENDATIONS

As a necessary step to recuperate our lost prestige throughout Latin America, Mr. NIXON described his new policy this way:

For dictators, a formal handshake; for officials of free countries, an embrace.

A report by a leading Latin American news magazine, *Vision*, recites the bill of particulars against the United States:

It is also hard to overestimate the complaint that the United States appears to support dictatorial governments. This is particularly serious today while a wave of political liberalism is sweeping Latin America. Most political leaders south of the border will agree that the United States must not interfere in the internal affairs of Latin-American countries. But they believe that more often than not, Washington has seemed to smile upon dictatorial regimes. They cannot forget that Milton Eisenhower was chummy with Juan Perón in his South American tour, or that Marcos Pérez Jiménez, who as dictator kept the jails of Venezuela well filled, seemed to be especially friendly with a former Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs who presumably approved the award of the Legion of Merit to Pérez Jiménez. The sorest point is that Pérez Jiménez and Pedro Estrada, his secret police chief, both received visas for the United States. As one Venezuelan editor put it: "Washington keeps out Charlie Chaplin the clown, but accepts Pérez Jiménez and Estrada, the butchers."

He further called for personnel changes in several spots to strengthen the administration's new policy of giving Latin America top priority. In addition, he advocated that personnel should be instructed to meet with people at all levels and not confine their contacts to the so-called elite.

THE JULY REPORT TO CONGRESS

Last year it was my privilege to visit with, among other distinguished Latin Americans, Gov. Muñoz-Marín of Puerto Rico; in Colombia with Dr. Eduardo Santos, the great former president and publisher of *El Tiempo*, and with Dr. Lleras Camargo, former Secretary-General of the OAS and recently elected President of Colombia; in Costa Rica with President Figueres and members of the Costa Rican Government; and finally in Panama with members of the Panamanian Press Association. On July 15, 10 months ago, I submitted to the House a record of my findings.

At that time I said:

It is with much sadness that I must inform you that these distinguished men, the real friends of the United States, are truly apprehensive of the path United States foreign policy seems to have taken in Latin America.

And later in the same report:

Latin Americans ask whether the liberty and justice under law which we are defending today means only liberty and justice under law for United States citizens. They want to know what liberties they are being asked to defend, when it is quite obvious that the people living under home-grown dictatorships are not enjoying even the most basic freedoms.

Ten months ago I tried to alert the House as follows:

The United States is becoming identified among the suffering in Latin America as a friend of the oppressor, with the result that United States moral prestige among the people who are suffering the rape of their human rights plunges to rock bottom. When the chips are down, we will want and need the help of the people, not of the single man who temporarily manipulates their government.

As for Pérez Jiménez, then riding high as the bloody dictator of Venezuela, I wrote:

In Costa Rica, Colombia, Panama and Puerto Rico I met many young Venezuelans from all walks of life—lawyers, engineers, farmers, architects—who are forced into a life of exile for the single crime of urging free elections, the basic tenet we proclaim so proudly in Europe, Asia, and the Far East. These Venezuelans are the minutemen of Venezuelan liberties, or if you prefer, the freedom fighters. Does it make sense for the United States to decorate the man for whom they are sacrificing family and comfort in the battle for liberty?

The incredible asylum granted Pérez Jiménez in these United States after his overthrow caused Vice President Nixon some trying moments in Caracas, we are told. Can we now wonder wide-eyed why the Venezuelan people are suspicious of our motives?

Ten months ago, I wrote in the report to Congress:

The strongest defense against communism in the Americas is a people determined to defend a democratic way of life. If dictatorships prevail and hold back the clamor for freedom south of the Rio Grande, we will find one day we have not only a soft but an infected underbelly.

To get our foreign policy back on keel, I recommended, among other things:

First. Instruct our Ambassadors in dictatorially governed countries to avoid all

unnecessary identification with the dictator. Instruct our Ambassadors to maintain proper, but cool, diplomatic relations, as they do in Iron Curtain countries.

Second. Encourage democratic nations to send their chiefs of state and other high officials to the United States. Honor them publicly—let them know the American people are on their side in the tough business of governing by democratic process. We should have an annual conference of democratic leaders.

Third. No medals to dictators.

Fourth. Curb all statements by official representatives of the United States Government which show approval of dictators.

When I arrived in Congress, Latin America was not consciously or even unconsciously on my mind. The disappearance of my constituent, Gerry Murphy, in another brutal hemisphere dictatorship plunged me into an examination of our Latin American policy. As I proceeded with the Gerry Murphy investigation, the glaring deficiencies in our Latin American policy became so apparent that they cried out for rectification.

MR. DULLES' BLIND SPOT

I am indeed sorry that it took the dimming spectacle of riots against the second highest official of the United States to jar us into action. Even now we are by no means assured that the State Department is prepared to recognize its past errors and to rectify them. The Secretary of State has already given public notice of his intention to do nothing.

One day before the Vice President's appearance at the Press Club, Mr. Dulles, in his press conference, gave evidence of a stubborn reluctance to concede any past errors on the part of his Department. Unlike Vice President Nixon, he minimizes the extent of the demonstrations. To listen to Mr. Dulles, the Caracas riots would never have occurred if only the Venezuelan Government had supplied an adequate and efficient police force.

If my information is correct, and I believe it is, Mr. Nixon had a duty to correct Mr. Dulles and so far as I have been able to learn he has not. A high Venezuelan official, who was present at the airport when Mr. Nixon arrived, told me that it was Mr. Nixon himself, the same man who had previously requested an open car for the ride into Caracas, who insisted that the guard for his party be reduced to practically nothing.

It is my understanding that Mr. Nixon went against expert and responsible advice in both Peru and Venezuela. Certainly Mr. Nixon should set the record straight publicly. In any case, to foist the blame upon the Venezuelan Government, as Mr. Dulles has, is inaccurate and most unfair to a government that deserves and needs our support.

As for the Vice President's recommendations regarding our apparently friendly support for dictators, Mr. Dulles clings to his moribund definition of intervention. The fact that the vast majority of Latin Americans, all of whom favor nonintervention, disagree with

him seems to make no impression on the Secretary of State.

Early this year I thought I detected a slight but significant change in the official policies of the State Department toward dictatorships and democracies in Latin America. The Department wrote me a letter, which has since been quoted approvingly, by both the *New York Times* editorially and by Assistant Secretary Rubottom, and in which this sentence appeared:

While we are not in a position to intervene in the internal developments of the countries of Latin America, we are in a position to feel—and we do feel—satisfaction and pleasure when the people of any country determinedly choose the road of democracy and freedom.

Apparently the official feeling and the general feeling are identical. An unequivocal and public expression of this feeling, however, is still forbidden, as are, apparently, actions which indicate we recognize the difference between a police state and a democracy.

In fairness to Mr. Dulles, we must recognize his deep preoccupation with other vital areas of the world. In the same week as the South American debacles, Mr. Dulles had to ponder the effects of the French crisis and of the Lebanese civil war. For years he has turned his attention across the Atlantic and across the Pacific. Latin America never has occupied a preeminent place in his thinking. By his remarks, it is evident that Mr. Dulles views the 20th century Latin American struggle for liberty as a 19th century battle for power between the "ins" and the "outs."

How he manages to separate the Latin Americans from similar revolutionary forces abroad in the Middle East and Asia is a mystery to me. Perhaps, in his preoccupation with other areas of the world, Latin American affairs have overtaken Mr. Dulles.

Let there be no illusions—the Communists recognize the burning aspirations of the Latin American people, even if Mr. Dulles does not. And as long as he conducts the personal diplomacy for which he is noted, it is to be expected that the State Department will base its policies in Latin America on Mr. Dulles' antiquated premises.

Mr. Nixon himself has stated that the true measure of the success of his journey will be in the policies the United States Government and the people practice in the future in relation to Latin American countries. Having won some acclaim at home for his determination to continue with his good-will tour in Peru and Venezuela, we now shall see whether Mr. Nixon will be as determined to push his reforms upon the reluctant Secretary of State.

In the meantime, it appears that the Vice President will need some coaching in order to live up to his own recommendations. At a time when the Inter-American Press Association and the Newspaper Guild of Managua denounced Generalissimo Somoza's heirs for their incredibly cruel tortures inflicted on a Nicaraguan newsman, Mr. Nixon allowed himself to be photographed wreathed in smiles and exuding good

will with Somoza's Ambassador to the United States. This was, by his own formula, an occasion for a formal handshake, not an embrace. It is likely that the picture will appear in Latin America—and, I ask you, with what effect on their feelings toward Mr. Nixon and the United States? I grant you, the representatives of the dictators here in the United States are smooth operators. They have had much practice in ingratiating themselves. It is up to us to put an end to their cynical game.

PUBLISH WHITE PAPER

How can we do so? We can begin by putting into practice Mr. Nixon's recommendations regarding treatment of hemisphere dictators. As a first step, the Department of State should publish a white paper to acquaint the American people with the tyrannical governments with which we have to deal in Latin America. Such exposure might have a salutary effect upon the current savage police state governments in the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, Paraguay, and Cuba. Unable to conduct their brutalities behind a smokescreen of cordiality, ignorance and universal acquiescence, the dictators would be served notice that their criminal acts do not go unnoticed beyond their shores. The readily obtainable facts about Pérez Jiménez, former Venezuelan dictator, should be published and given to General Swing, the Immigration and Naturalization Commissioner, who then could easily and quickly boot him out of the country on an exclusion proceeding.

INSTRUCT UNITED STATES DIPLOMATS

Secondly, our Ambassadors to the Latin American countries should be recalled for instructions in the New Look, with respect to when to handshake and when to embrace. It should be made clear to one and all that United States interest lies in promoting democratic ideals throughout the hemisphere, and not in alliance with vicious dictatorships whose collapse is inevitable. It should be made crystal clear that the American people want their representatives abroad to show our favor for and faith in the forces that are striving for democratic ideals. Sympathetic unity of the democratic forces throughout the Western Hemisphere is, clearly, the only true defense against Communist subversion in the New World.

CUT OFF MUTUAL ASSISTANCE TO DICTATORSHIPS

Thirdly, we should cut off mutual-assistance funds and military missions to hemisphere dictators, something which was furthered by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the other day when it adopted an amendment by Senator MORSE. Throughout his South American trip, Mr. Nixon heard criticism that our military and economic aid was being used by the dictators to perpetuate their power. The question is not one of correcting a wrong impression, as Mr. Dulles would want us to believe. Unfortunately, the Latin American interpretation is correct. Let us put an end to the criticism at its source—the misguided and misrepresentative policy here at home.

The recent case of the \$600,000 that goes through Generalissimo Trujillo to

his wayward boy of 29 is a pathetic, but apt, example. Those who argue that our aid to Trujillo is necessary in the fight against Communist domination also argue that Trujillo is our great ally in the fight against communism. If Trujillo were sincere in his anticommunism, he would be our ally with or without our aid. As for the mutual-assistance funds which are supposedly devoted to raising the standards of the Dominican people, the recent incident has made it obvious that the Trujillos have plenty of money squeezed from slave labor on their island paradise to provide their own needed reforms. But what happens to the United States in such a deal? Our money goes down the drain, while at the same time Latin American people read us off as fools, or, worse still, as intent on buying the tyrant's worthless and degrading friendship.

If we learned anything from the Caracas incident, it is that in the world struggle in which we are engaged, the cooperation of a dictator will avail us nothing if he sits upon the powder keg of his own people's fury. Above all, then, let us divorce ourselves from identification with the few remaining hemisphere despots. Let us show all the Latin American people that we understand and sympathize with their aspirations for freedom with justice.

This hemisphere, which produced men of the caliber of Bolivar, Marti, Jefferson, and San Martin, may yet see the day when we are united in our devotion to democratic processes. We need only to keep working at it, through every possible avenue and always with the goal in sight. We can get back on the track. All it takes is an honest recognition that autocratic governments are not reliable allies against communism, but that our true allies lie in the Latin American people themselves.

One thing, then, is certain: We must apply ourselves to find the facts necessary for a new, better relationship with Latin America. Another thing, which could be crucial, is uncertain, and that is whether Mr. Nixon will follow through. The Vice President has been a force for good in many instances. He has supported the mutual security and reciprocal trade programs with resourcefulness and energy in the face of strong opposition in his own party. His conduct has in many other ways been praiseworthy. There may in fact be a new Nixon. Whether he would backslide to the old Nixon were he elected President is a question for the 1960 campaign, when, I can assure you, it will be amply discussed from all viewpoints.

The question today is with respect to Latin America. Mr. Nixon should correct Mr. Dulles about the adequacy of the police protection and apology to the Venezuelan Government for the delay in setting the record straight. He will also make it clear that he believes the present State Department policy, as reaffirmed by Mr. Dulles the other day, must be changed and at once. Finally, he will acknowledge that the picture of himself and the Nicaraguan Ambassador will have unfortunate effects in Latin America and was an error of exactly the

kind he is seeking to eradicate from our official policies.

Mr. Nixon has shown to the United States and the world the gaping wound in our relationships with Latin America. The question is now, will he follow through to use his considerable talents to treat the wound? It is too soon to answer that question but not too soon to call attention to the disquieting signs that lead many to believe we may again be disappointed.

MISSOURI'S MAGNIFICENT CAPITOL BUILDING

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, Missouri has one of the best and most imposing capitol buildings in the United States, and the following article printed in the St. Louis Review reveals the interesting and informative historical events in connection with the location and construction of Missouri's magnificent capitol building:

SOLONS IN SCHOOL—CATHOLIC PARISH BUILDING WAS NINTH MISSOURI CAPITOL, HELPED KEEP STATE GOVERNMENT IN JEFFERSON CITY

(By the Reverend Peter J. Rahll)

A parochial school building in Jefferson City played a vital part in the capitol of Missouri remaining in the central Missouri city. And the fulfillment of its role entitled St. Peter's school hall to be known as the ninth capitol of the State. What was the stirring drama of which this was the climax?

During the last quarter of the 19th century agitation persisted for the removal of the headquarters of the State from Jefferson City. The chief aspirant for the honor was Sedalia, some distance to the west but still in central Missouri. A century and a quarter has long since accustomed Missourians to the Jefferson City locale. But on into the 20th century it was pointed out that the capitals of many other States had been changed. Moreover, Missouri itself had 3 cities as the seat of government and after 1887 was occupying its 8th capitol structure.

The first State Legislature, however, had anchored the capitol to a site within 40 miles of the mouth of the Osage River and on the banks of the Missouri itself. Yet this initial general assembly of the State was meeting in the second in the list of State capitol buildings. The first—like the second, long since demolished—was the Mansion House, a hotel then at the northeast corner of Third and Vine Streets in St. Louis. The constitutional convention of the State deliberated for 5 weeks in the early summer of 1820, using the main dining room of that hotel for its sessions.

A second hostelry gained the distinction of state capitol the following fall. Built the previous year, the Missouri Hotel was on the southwest corner of Main and Morgan (now Delmar Boulevard). Among the many enactments by the 57 members of this first assembly was the selection of two capitol sites, one temporary and the other permanent.

ON THE BANK OF THE MISSOURI

In the considerations of the legislature the permanent site was not limited to the present Jefferson City. In fact, the commissioners chosen to make the selection came to favor the village of Cote san Dessein, on the north side of the Missouri River opposite the mouth of the Osage. That would have conformed perfectly to the specification "on the bank of the Missouri River, and within

forty miles of the mouth of the river Osage." Fortunately for the State of Missouri, on the last day of 1821 Governor Alexander McNear affixed his signature to the bill selecting Jefferson City. Had Cote san Dessein been chosen, certainly at least one more site would have entered and disappeared from the list of capitals of Missouri. Shortly thereafter that town was to suffer the fate of New Franklin in being obliterated from the map by the turbulent waters of the Missouri.

Though Cote san Dessein claimed to be no more than a village, its size could not have been the deciding factor against its selection. When the Governor penned his signature on December 31, 1821, the future City of Jefferson had exactly two families. In that condition it was at most a hazy future site for the capitol, and meanwhile the legislative and executive headquarters had been transferred to Saint Charles. The unpretentious brick structure which served as capitol until 1826, still stands on Main Street today. Its plain two stories are distinguished from its neighbors solely by a plaque near the entrance. Better than anything written, the little building offers striking testimony to the growth in population and prosperity of Missouri in the succeeding century and a quarter.

A townsite for the projected permanent capitol was laid out in the spring of 1822. On the very hill where the Governor's mansion now overlooks the turgid Missouri a two-story edifice was erected. Though no picture presently is available of the structure, it was about twice the size of the third state capitol in St. Charles. Besides the two chambers for the separate houses of the assembly, the new building was also the residence of the Governor.

FLAMES DESTROY EVERYTHING

The primeval bluffs of Cole County delayed but did not prohibit execution of the plans. On October 1, 1826, the fourth capitol was occupied in the city of Jefferson. Unfortunately all of the historical records from three predecessors were gathered in the new structure. Unfortunately is the proper term, for like King James dropping the Great Seal of England in the Thames, it meant their complete disappearance. In 1837 a fire destroyed the building entirely, together with the precious records. The flames obliterated any clear memory of this capitol, for, as mentioned apparently no picture of it exists.

The Cole County courthouse served as temporary headquarters. No precipitate planning was forced upon the administration of Gov. Lilburn W. Boggs, for a certain precidence had pervaded the legislature the previous term. More than 9 months before the conflagration of November 17, 1837, plans for a new capitol had been approved. When the new home was entered in 1840 Governor Boggs proclaimed that it was fireproof throughout.

This sixth capitol was hailed as the best example of classical design in the United States. And it endured during the railroad building era, the Civil War, and on into the first administration of a Democratic President since the secession of the South. Nor did it then pass out of existence. However, the remodeling of 1887 and the following year was so extensive that the renovated structure was termed the seventh capitol.

If there had been no disaster to impel this addition to the number of State houses, a very real attempt had been made to force its removal. And the site proposed was much farther west than the transfer of the 1830's from the location of the present mansion. During the post-Civil War period clamor commenced for a complete change. This movement did not subside until St. Peter's hall became the ninth capitol of the State.

SELF-NOMINATED SUCCESSOR

The contention that the seat of government should be moved not a few feet or

yards but out of Cole County altogether came principally from a self-nominated successor, Sedalia. Though admittedly 2 generations younger than Jefferson City, the county seat of Pettis County had grown surprisingly in both population and aspirations. With no aspersions on the verdant soil of central Missouri, the rising town was not long content to "waste its sweetness on the desert air." In February of 1881, for instance, the city fathers offered to donate 100 acres of land and deposit \$200,000 in the State treasury, all for the purpose of becoming the capital of Missouri. Though a committee of the State legislative body received the invitation, the proposition never reached the point of being submitted to the people of Missouri.

The expense of the 1887 remodeling, which was almost half of the original cost of the capitol, argued that the issue had been settled. Such a decision was not accepted by the leading residents of Pettis County. After a quarter-century of propaganda, the supporters of Sedalia succeeded in bringing the matter out of the legislative chambers to the popular ballot box. In 1894 John Bothwell introduced a measure in the House of Representatives and Charles Yeater in the Senate, providing for submission of the question of removal of the electorate. In February of 1895 the State assembly authorized the vote at the next general election. Thus a year and a half were allowed for electioneering.

With Jefferson City in the entrenched position of possession, the burden of appeal to the populace had to be borne by the Sedalians. Nor was there any reluctance in the assumption of the office. From the booklets and leaflets surviving it is evident that considerable money as well as advertising skill were expended by the protagonists of the Pettis County site. The personal profit motive was not lacking, judging by the part taken by a real estate firm which offered lots to give "Sedalia's friends a quick opportunity to make lightning profits."

NO EXPENSE TO STATE

As in the 1881 proposal, so in the last decade of the 19th century Sedalia was to furnish the capitol site, erect new buildings, and move equipment and records without any expense to the State. Bonds totaling \$615,000 were filed to guarantee payment of these costs, and in accepting them Gov. William J. Stone was quoted as saying: "I do not see how better bonds could have been presented." Though they would not necessarily all have been supporters of the removal, an imposing list of bankers from most sections of the State allowed their names to be enumerated among the endorers of the bonds.

When the campaign commenced the remodeling of the capitol in Cole County was finished but 7 years. But it is understandable that Sedalians contended expensive rebuilding would be needed in any event because of the inadequate and decaying public edifices at Jefferson City. The original part of the capitol was then more than a half-century old.

Rebuilt or not, advocates of the proposed constitutional amendment could see no comparison with the intrinsic advantages of the site being in Sedalia. First of all, the capitol would be more imposing because the exact site proposed for the buildings had an elevation of 1,000 feet, almost twice that of Jefferson City. Then they pointed out the location would be more central in the State. From maps emphasizing this advantage, Sedalia appeared to be the railroad hub of the country. Some of the lines have since been abandoned or consolidated, such as the Kansas City & St. Louis Railroad, while others never materialized, as the Kansas City to St. Louis route via Sedalia of the Sante Fe system.

More eloquent were the advocates when referring to relative population growth of

the two cities. According to the analysis, the existing capital had gained barely more than 100 people annually since it was founded in 1826. In contrast to Jefferson City's population of 7,000, Sedalia in 3 decades had more than 20,000 residents. The concluding statement was this wicked barb: "To call Jefferson City a city is equal to calling a nickel a dollar."

Radio and television awaiting the next century, this information—and much more—was broadcast through pamphlets and booklets. In some places school children distributed the literature. The popular appeal of the measure was demonstrated by widespread participation in a raffle, in which the grand prize was a reproduction of the Eiffel Tower. The profit realized was used to finance the campaign for removal.

ARCHBISHOP IS QUOTED

Those favoring the retention of Jefferson City were more optimistic, for the law of inertia applies outside of the field of physics. Notwithstanding, every favorable incident or statement was widely publicized. For instance, St. Peter's parish in Jefferson City celebrated its golden jubilee in 1896. As part of the festivities a reception was held for Archbishop John J. Kain of St. Louis about a month before the election. The local German-language Post featured a statement by the archbishop that Jefferson City was the capital of the State and should so remain.

Interest abounded in the election of 1896. The multiplicity of issues and personalities may have cooled the ardor of the advocates of changing capitol sites or lessened the attention accorded to their arguments. The majority party in Missouri, the Democrats, was split over Free Silver and Sound Money into Bryanites and Clevelandites. Late in August delegates to a St. Louis gathering of Democrats repudiated the platform adopted in Chicago the previous month by the national convention. Though a rival ticket of Palmer and Buckner was placed on the ballot, not enough votes were attracted to prevent William Jennings Bryan from carrying the State.

The vote on capitol removal to Sedalia was made on the same November day. About 20 percent of those who marked ballots for President omitted any decision on the amendment to the State constitution. And the outcome was no photo finish, for the opponents of the transfer to Pettis County numbered 334,819, compared with 181,258 favoring removal. Sedalia had lost—but hope was not abandoned.

For almost a generation the aspiration reposed in an uneasy sleep. The clap of thunder which awakened Sedalia—and all other candidates for the capitol site—followed close upon a lightning flash. This bolt ricocheted across the clouds early Sunday evening, February 5, 1911, and struck the flagstaff atop the capitol dome. Some say the electric siver caused the lantern hanging in the dome to burst into flame. In any event the fingers of fire whisked down the wooden arches to the roof of the building. In less than 3 hours the seventh capitol had suffered the same fiery fate as the fourth. The happy exception was that the State records were preserved by fireproof vaults.

ONE-HUNDRED-AND-EIGHTY-FIVE-FOOT DOME COLLAPSES

Additional papers and records had been saved because Gov. Herbert S. Hadley and other State executives had dared to enter the blazing furnace of the capitol and carry them to safety. The local Daily Post (by then printed in English) declared that a metropolitan fire department could not have coped with the mad flames. Sedalia, long-time aspirant for the capitol site, hastily sent its own fire fighting equipment on railroad flatcars to save the Cole County edifice. The train arrived just as the 185-foot

dome collapsed over the chamber of the house of representatives.

The legislature convened the next afternoon, as had been provided for by the adjournment motion of the preceding Friday. But place and atmosphere had been radically altered. Within the walls of the Jefferson Theater, in Jefferson City, the representatives heard offers of quarters for the State government which had been telegraphed from places as widely separated in Missouri as Palmyra, Springfield, St. Joseph, St. Louis, and Macon. In returning thanks the house voted approval of a motion that the assembly "would be doing business in Jefferson City" the next day. Since none of the members had been inside the capitol when the lightning bolt struck, the following resolution was not ambiguous:

"Resolved, That each and every member who succeeded in getting his seat out of the old capitol building be allowed the same without cost."

If the old seats were to be retained, no such certainty existed about the site of the capitol itself. The second morning after the fire, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat strongly advocated that the city of its publication become the official headquarters of Missouri. While the Governor promptly opposed removal to St. Louis or any other point, it was unthinkable that any final decision be reached then.

A special committee had been appointed to seek quarters for the house of representatives. When the assembly convened in the opera house on Wednesday this group reported that "we have secured St. Peter's hall in Jefferson City, Mo., to be used for said purpose, free of cost to the State." Legislators were leaving that night for St. Louis to obtain the needed furniture. It was also mentioned that the pastor of St. Peter's parish, the Reverend Joseph Sellinger, had gone to obtain the approval of Archbishop John J. Glennon of his offer to the State.

PAROCHIAL BUILDING ACCEPTED

The senate completed arrangements for using the Missouri Supreme Court Building. Accordingly, James H. Hull, of Platte County, moved, on February 13, that the choice of the upper house be approved. At the same time the representatives accepted his resolution that "the house meet in St. Peter's hall of the Catholic parochial school building." And with the official convening of the assembly the following day St. Peter's hall became the ninth capitol of the State of Missouri. Aside from such incidental decisions as providing camp stools for visitors, the school hall retained its distinction for the remainder of the 46th general assembly.

The momentary impulse to move the seat of government elsewhere had thus been check-mated. But a capitol without a capitol was at best insecure in its status. An attempt to commit the house to remaining in the Cole County city was made during the initial session in St. Peter's Hall, but was referred to committee. More than a month elapsed after the fire before it was agreed to investigate the purchase of additional lots in Jefferson City "for use of the permanent seat of government." Whether it was facetious or not, the vulnerability of the incumbent's position was demonstrated by the adoption of a resolution on February 20 which read: "If Jefferson City desires the new capitol they clean the snow off the sidewalks." As the Kansas City Star said of the city, "Its right to go ahead in security of investment was menaced every time some legislator had dyspepsia or some lawyer lost a case in the supreme court."

THANKS FOR CONSIDERATION

As indicated by the resolutions of the assembly, the pastor of St. Peter's parish, Father Sellinger, had made the hall available without charge. Certainly considerable inconvenience and expense were thereby in-

curring. Official notice was taken of this generosity before the reconstruction of the capitol on any site was decided. On March 18 the house adopted a resolution of C. P. Hawkins of Dunklin County that the State pay the expenses which had accrued to Father Sellinger from the representatives using the hall. At the same time the assembly expressed its thanks "for the consideration shown to it and the people of Missouri."

No plan for a new capitol was in readiness, as had been true after the fire of 1837. A design for a building to be erected in Jefferson City was finally approved by this assembly. However, the expenditure needed the approval of the people, and a special election for this purpose was fixed for August 1. The issuance of the bonds could be opposed on several scores, one of which was the desire to transfer Missouri's headquarters to another city. And a two-third majority being required for the \$3½ million bond issue, a minority could defeat the proposal.

The actual vote was not very close. Though the expectation had been that the bonds would be approved, the inward, concealed fear which beset the proponents is proved by the reaction to the victory. Especially in Jefferson City was the jubilation uncontrolled. Torchlight processions queued through the crowded streets, horsemen rode their steeds into bars for another drink—at least for the rider, and the hills of Calloway County across the river had been etched by the dawn before the rollickers ceased their shouts. Older residents of the capital agree that it was by far the wildest celebration in the history of the city.

A couple of days after the February conflagration the Daily Post of Jefferson City published the following statement: "It can, then, be safely said that Sedalia is not in favor of capital removal." That was hardly borne out by the election tallies. Outside of the deep Ozarks, Pettis was the only county in the State which voted against the bonds. But if the residents there were expressing a faint in vain hope for becoming the legislative center of the State, the Kansas City Times phrased an apt question about the singularity of other voters: "Speaking of mule obstinacy and general darned cussedness, who were the 14 citizens of Cole County who voted against the bonds?"

Jefferson City, the site chosen by the legislature and approved by Governor McNair back in 1821, was to endure as the capital of Missouri. With the money available from the bonds a superb plan was executed in the majestic structure now paralleling the Missouri River. How many visitors who enter the building by the grand stairway—said to be the widest in the world—realize that a block down High Street there still stands the reason for its commanding location? St. Peter's Hall had its glory as the ninth capitol numbered almost by moments. That summer of 1911 a temporary structure was erected, its stuccoed walls costing three times as much as the first capitol in Cole County. And with its occupancy St. Peter's Hall and the Supreme Court Building reverted to their original status. But as Horatio at the bridge, the parish auditorium had stemmed further loss to the city of Jefferson after the flame of February 5 had simmered to ashes.

INSURING THAT THE AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL CONTINUES 80 PERCENT FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN WILDLIFE-CONSERVING PRACTICES UNDER THE CONSERVATION RESERVE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wis-

consin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, conservationists and sportsmen vigorously supported the adding of wildlife-conserving practices to the conservation reserve when the Soil Bank was adopted 2 years ago. For the first time, we recognized that the farmer who followed sound wildlife conservation practices should be adequately compensated for doing on his land what benefited the entire country. Under the conservation reserve, the Department of Agriculture has approved paying farmers up to 80 percent of the cost of such wildlife-conserving practices as planting food and cover—multiflora roses, trees, and shrubs, for instance—for wild game, and creating or restoring marshy areas for waterfowl and muskrats.

Throughout the Nation, the wildlife practices provision has fostered the most healthy cooperation between farmers and city conservationists. In Wisconsin, for example, conservationists are finding that the 80 percent cost-sharing by the Federal Government is beginning to interest farmers in adopting good wildlife-conserving practices. Throughout America such organizations as the National Wildlife Federation have succeeded in obtaining ever-greater participation by farmers in the wildlife aspects of the conservation reserve. The Federation has set up an entire division to prosecute this program, led by H. R. Morgan, the very able former Game and Fish Commissioner of North Dakota.

Mr. Morgan tells me that more than 10 State conservation agencies have in the last year participated actively in the carrying out of wildlife practices under the conservation reserve. With continued Federal interest in the program, we can soon look for the cooperation of conservation commissions in each of the 48 States.

Earlier today the conference report—House Report No. 1776—on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to H. R. 11767, the 1959 agriculture appropriations bill, came before the House. Further consideration of a motion by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] concerning amendment No. 17 in disagreement, having to do with the conservation reserve program, was put over until tomorrow.

In order that the legislative history of H. R. 11767 may be entirely clear, I insert an exchange of letters between myself and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] which took place this afternoon, following the action on H. R. 11767 just referred to. The letters follow:

MAY 27, 1958.

The Honorable JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JAMIE: Earlier today, during the consideration of the conference report (H. Rept. 1776) on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to H. R. 11767, the 1959 agriculture appropriation bill, I asked leave to speak in opposition to, and for an automatic rollcall vote on, a motion made by you on amendment No. 17 (conservation reserve program), which had been reported in disagreement. Your motion asked that in lieu of the matter

stricken and inserted by amendment No. 17, there should be inserted the following:

"Provided further, That hereafter no conservation reserve contract shall be entered into which provides for (1) payments for conservation practices in excess of the average rate for comparable practices under the agricultural conservation program, or (2) annual rental payments in excess of 20 percent of the value of the land placed under contract, such value to be determined without regard to physical improvements thereon or geographic location thereof. In determining the value of the land for this purpose, the county committee shall take into consideration the estimate of the landowner or operator as to the value of such land as well as his certificate as to the production history and productivity of such lands."

I did so solely because I feared that the first portion of this quoted language—"Provided further, that hereafter no conservation reserve contract shall be entered into which provides for (1) payments for conservation practices in excess of the average rate for comparable practices under the agricultural conservation program,"—might conceivably be construed to require a departure from the present practice under the conservation reserve of the Soil Bank whereby the Department of Agriculture pays farmers up to 80 percent of the cost of such wildlife-conserving practices as planting food and cover for wild game, and creating and restoring marshy areas for wild game. Specifically, I feared that these wildlife-conserving practices might be held to be comparable to practices under the agricultural conservation program, and thus the payments reduced to 50 percent.

Such a construction, of course, would be disastrous to the wildlife-conserving program. To the extent that conservation practices under the conservation reserve and under the agricultural conservation program are substantially comparable, and are in large part for the benefit of the participating farmer, such as payments for liming and terracing, I would respect the judgment that a 50-percent contribution by the Department of Agriculture is adequate. For wildlife-conserving practices, however, where the benefit accrues more largely to the whole community than to the participating farmer, an 80-percent contribution by the Agriculture Department is necessary in order to make participation attractive.

From our discussion of this point on the floor today following the action taken to postpone further consideration of the conference report on H. R. 11767 until tomorrow, I understand that the intention of the language above cited is that "comparable practices" do not include wildlife-conserving practices, since such practices are not included under the agricultural conservation program. In other words, your amendment will not preclude the Department of Agriculture's paying, as it now does, up to 80 percent for wildlife-conserving practices under the conservation reserve.

I have obtained a special order for later this afternoon in order to discuss this question, and I should deeply appreciate your confirming to me the correctness of my understanding of your views, as the author of the above language. As I indicated to you on the floor, I believe a construction of the language along the lines I have here set forth would not give rise to the fears I have here expressed.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

MAY 27, 1958.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HENRY: With regard to your letter asking our construction of the language of-

ferred by motion on amendment No. 17, I would state the following:

The language intends that there shall be comparable payments for comparable practices under each the conservation reserve program and the agricultural conservation program. There is nothing in the agricultural conservation program which requires any lower rate of payment than that allowed by the Department in the conservation reserve program. In other words, comparable payments could be made by bringing one up to the other as well as by scaling down.

Now as to practices for conservation of wildlife, I know of no comparable practices in the agricultural conservation program; however, should there be, I believe there should be a comparable rate of payment. I believe this to be the intent of the conferees.

Sincerely,

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
Member of Congress.

This exchange of letters makes it abundantly clear that the 1959 agriculture appropriation bill permits payments by the Department of Agriculture, as at present, of up to 80 percent for wildlife-conserving practices under the conservation reserve.

FIFTH ANNUAL GOOD GOVERNMENT DINNER OF CROSSCUP-PISHON POST NO. 281, AMERICAN LEGION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I shall divide the time allotted me in two speeches.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 8, the fifth annual good government dinner of the Crosscup-Pishon Post, No. 281, the American Legion, took place at the Sheraton Plaza Hotel, in Boston, Mass. This distinguished post of the American Legion selected me as their honor guest and presented me with their annual good-government award. This constitutes a very high honor, and I shall treasure the memory for the rest of my life.

On this important occasion, I was invited to make the principal address of the evening. Following herewith is my address:

Commander Talberth, veterans of the Crosscup-Pishon Post of the American Legion, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, my first words to you this evening I hope will convey the sincerity and depth of my feeling and appreciation on this memorable occasion. I am grateful, so deeply grateful to have been selected by the Crosscup-Pishon Post, this very distinguished post of the American Legion, to be honored and presented with its award of good government. Also, I am honored by all of you here this evening who have taken these precious moments of your busy lives and from your friendly homes to come here for this particular occasion. My heart is warmed by this knowledge and touched with this evidence of your friendliness and respect.

My second words are those of thanks—my thanks to this very distinguished post of the American Legion for selecting me to be their honored guest this evening. To the officers and members of the Crosscup-Pishon Post I give my thanks for this exceptional good-government award. To all of you who have presented me with the honor of your presence here this evening I extend my thanks. At this moment, all I

have to offer all of you is my heartfelt thanks. Please know that my appreciation is deeply embedded in my heart and life.

This evening and on other occasions, I have been mentioned very respectfully as "The No. 1 friend of the veteran." To be thought of in this way, even though I feel I do not qualify, is a tribute of the highest order. To be thought of in this way is a distinguished honor, for I consider our men and women veterans not only the largest but the finest group of deeply loyal and dedicated Americans to be found anywhere in the Nation. Through the processes of good government their purpose is to protect the country and our way of life from enemies within and without.

The people of the United States of America, as well as the people of the Free World, will never know and will never be able to fully measure the tremendous contributions given to our country and to the cause of freedom by our veterans, not only on the field of battle, but also in the daily molding of the greatness of America and the strength of the cause of freemen everywhere. The veterans know so well the necessity for good government, dependable government and a government of integrity and respect. Unless our Government is honorable and respected, and dependable, our country and free way of life is doomed to treachery, selfishness, exploitation, and chaos. This good-government award of the Crosscup-Pishon Post is representative of this high purpose of the American Legion.

As we think of government and all that it means to us in our lives, I think you will agree with me that one of the principal mileposts in all history was the formation and establishment of the American system of government. Our Constitution has been the pattern for the government of many nations. It has provided the way of orderly conduct for old countries which have won new freedom and independence.

Minus a few years, it has been my honor to be associated with the operation of our Government for almost half of a century. This is a long time. It has been an eventful period in our history. There have been times of joy and times of heartache. I shall speak briefly of these great events during this half century.

Much has happened since the early days of 1913 when my late husband and I arrived in Washington to commence our representation of the people of Massachusetts in the Congress of the United States. Woodrow Wilson was about to be inaugurated President. The horse and carriage was still competing with the automobile as a means of transportation. Europe and the rest of the world seemed as far away as the moon does today. In population, our Nation was half the size it is now. Arizona and New Mexico had only recently become members of the Union, completing the forty-eight States, and their newly elected representatives were on hand to take their seats in Congress. In 1913, radio and television were unknown. There were no electric refrigerators, laundry or garbage disposal machines, and many other of the conveniences so common to all of us today were unknown then. The great oceans isolated our country, and that was the way we preferred to be. We went along our own way. We were still engaged in the development of our country. We were just reaching national maturity.

Then came 1914 and war in Europe. Little did any of us realize then, that 3 years later, on April 6, 1917, our own country would become a part of this great conflict. Some of you here tonight were among the Yanks who went over there to do the job. It was in the trenches and on the fields of battle of World War I, where men became friends while fighting together in a gigantic struggle for freedom against oppression. This was

the war to make the world safe for democracy. This was where the American Legion was born. This was where this distinguished Post had its beginning.

After World War I came reconstruction and the dreams of a great future. Out of the war, however, came a reality which was to change our lives here in America. The airplane had proved itself and the air age with its great development of air power was thrust upon us. No one knew its full meaning but everyone knew the whole world was changed.

In these early days after the war, I used to fly whenever I had the opportunity. Always I flew back and forth between Lowell and Washington. The planes were small and very fragile compared to the enormous airliners of today. Many of them were open cockpit and one had to dress in heavy clothing to protect themselves from the weather and the rigors of flying. In addition to getting pleasure from air travel, I engaged in it for the purpose of creating public confidence in the airplane as a means of travel and in this way to assist this young industry in our country to get firmly started. I knew its military potential was very great. Having no usable airplanes of our own in the war, I knew it was time our country was busy. The airplane was soon to be a vital weapon in our national defense.

A few years after the war, in 1927, the intrepid Lindbergh flew his Spirit of St. Louis in a nonstop flight across the wide Atlantic from New York to Paris. Now we knew the ocean could be crossed by an airplane. This fact all of a sudden eliminated distance between the nations of the world. This fact was to change our whole concept of foreign policy.

After those early flights across the ocean, and from continent to continent, the leadership of America knew that a policy of isolation was no longer feasible. We knew that in this air age that had suddenly come upon us, the whole world had been brought very close together in the sense of time and distance. This fact also disclosed very clearly the necessity for understanding and cooperation between nations for the great oceans no longer constituted protection and isolation was no longer possible.

Then the age of the 1930's was upon us. This was the decade of national struggle everywhere and economic adjustment. These were the days when we were told by President Roosevelt that we had nothing to fear but fear itself. These were the days when we were testing our ability as a Nation to plan and manage our own economy. These were the days of new laws and regulations which seemingly placed limitations upon our cherished freedom. We never succeeded, however, in testing completely our ability to control our national economy and our national economic life because of a sudden and great catastrophe.

It was now 1939 and in the late summer, Germany marched into Poland. War again darkened the sky. Then came that Sunday morning dawn and Pearl Harbor. World War II in all its fury was upon us and once again we were fighting for survival and this precious free way of life.

This gigantic conflict is still so close to all of us that I am not going to recount here the great deeds of heroism and sacrifice or any of the great events that took place. Many of you know them from personal experience so much better than I do. Like World War I, however, World War II also changed the way of living for everyone—everywhere. As this enormous tragic struggle was drawing to a close, one day in the late summer of 1945, a great bomb burst over Hiroshima, and with its bursting the whole world was cataclysmic into the atomic age.

In this atomic age, developments have taken place so rapidly that mankind now seems only a few steps away from the threshold over which he is certain to step, into

a vastly wider comprehension of space and the universe. Explosive power, destructive power, is now measured in units known as megatons. It is now possible as we all so clearly realize, for man to destroy completely his own civilization. Within a matter of hours one nation can completely destroy another. Here again, the existence of this new power has changed our entire foreign policy.

Out of this situation has been born the necessity of collective security. Our foreign policy must be directed toward associating and joining together the free nations of the world for defense and security purposes, while at the same time our foreign policy must be directed toward the prevention of a catastrophic nuclear war. On the one hand, we must do everything we can to provide strength for defense, while on the other hand, we must do everything we can to prevent the necessity for using that strength. There is no substitute for survival.

Here we are, then, ladies and gentlemen, in the daily living of the present. All of us are so busy with our daily responsibilities it is difficult to comprehend the forces that are gradually changing the way in which we live during these swiftly passing days. The closer great forces are to us, the more difficult it is for us to see them and comprehend them. The obvious, however, is most important. As a nation, we must recognize these forces in time so that we might control them and channel them into positive benefits rather than allowing them to disintegrate into tragedy. Now the practical meaning of this statement is this. We need collective security and we need wide and genuine cooperation among the free nations of the world, which look to our United States of America not only for leadership but for most of the military power that gives the collective security any strength. Leadership in our country must know how far the United States can go in the giving away of our capital, resources, and substance. In this collective cooperative effort, if world peace is to be maintained, the economy of the United States must be healthy and strong at all times. If our American economy ever breaks from over-extension of the enormous burdens our Nation is carrying throughout the world, communism and the Soviet bloc of nations will have achieved their greatest victory.

Our world today is made up of many nations, and more and more these nations must work together. Cooperation, however, is based upon mutual requirements and benefits. Most nations will not cooperate unless it is to that nation's advantage to do so. No nation can afford great sacrifices over a long period of time without balancing benefits and advantages. In international life, it avails nothing to the giver if nothing is received in return for the giving. If the economy of the United States becomes weakened or jeopardized, the organizations of free nations will disintegrate. If the United States fails to keep her economy sound and strong as well as our military power, the free way of life will perish from this earth.

There are many issues which I could discuss at length with you this evening which in my view directly affects the soundness and strength of our national economy. In some cases the recommendations relating to the solution of these problems are in direct conflict in principle. This is a weakness in our Government, its processes and operations, which of course must be averted. I shall not take up these issues at this time because I do not believe this is a fitting place or time to discuss them. I will leave only this thought with you. In the consistency of policy, whether it be national or international, there is strength, while in conflicting policy, there is chaos and ruin.

Now, after this nearly half-century of service in Government, this half-century of crisis and turmoil, this half-century of experience, this half-century of service to the people of Massachusetts and our country, we stand together at the doorway to the future. All of you, I believe, will agree that the steps we take, the actions we initiate today should not be controlled from the viewpoint of the present but considered for the effect and value they would bring to the future. It is not our lives we are concerned with. It is the lives of our children and grandchildren, and of the new generations yet to come, that we hope the actions we take today will bring to them a better and a secure world tomorrow.

Truly, this is the age of science. This age will extend for a long time as the future merges into the ever-progressing present. Life and living in tomorrow's world will be dependent upon science and the men and women trained to constantly push away the frontiers and discover unknown revelations for the benefit of humanity which is ever flowing onward. Science, and all that it is possible for it to develop, is not something apart from living. It is made up of men and women dedicated to the improvement of mankind. The objective of science is the improvement of life and living in this world. All of us here this evening would like to hope that every step forward of science in the future is for the benefit of mankind's life on this earth rather than for the destruction of man's civilization. This is the challenge—the challenge of science, the challenge of government, and the challenge of politics. We must marshal our talents in these great areas of knowledge so that man and his civilization can live and progress in a peaceful world and possibly, I should say, in a peaceful universe.

I am confident we can marshal our talents, because already we are doing so in a very large measure. Medical science has conquered polio, and momentarily stands near the solution of cure for the dreaded disease of cancer. The hidden mysteries of heart failure are gradually being uncovered and ways found to prevent their development. All through the field of medicine and surgery great strides are under way which will bring more life and longer life to the generations yet to come.

New industrial methods are being developed that are constantly reducing hazards of labor and making the manufacturing process a safer and enjoyable occupation. New types of houses incorporating many new advances for the comfort of living are being developed. Soon heat will either be produced in our homes by atomic processes or by the rays of the sun. New and safer methods of public transportation are already under way. These new developments and many, many more illustrate there is no limitation to the mind and invention of man.

The world of 25 years from now, or 50 years, or 100 years, can be almost a fantasy world if man is permitted to employ his limitless talents for benefits rather than destruction. Would it not be thrilling and wonderful if we could look in about 100 years from now upon the world of that tomorrow which is so dependent upon our decisions today? The more daring people might be rocketing to Mars for their vacation pleasures.

At this time there are over 20 million American veterans. There is no group of men and women anywhere for whom I have greater respect. Because of these veterans, and I am repeating my earlier thoughts, among whom are the members of this distinguished Crosscup-Pishon Post, our Nation is able to progress and function in freedom. Because of them, the people of other nations enjoy more or less of the free way of life. Because of them, the great United States of America is still progressing on the pathways

of its destiny. But regardless of the priceless deeds of accomplishment of these veterans, in all candor, I say to you, I hope there never again will be a necessity that will cause their number to increase. In other words, I hope that international forces will cease to be employed as a means of concluding international controversy. All of you, I am sure, join with me in our hopes and dreams that catastrophic warfare will never again be a reality in our world.

In talking about the future, it seems to me only fitting that I should devote a thought or two to those of us here this evening. As for Emma Nourse Rogers, the Member of Congress from the Fifth District of Massachusetts, I will say this. My Congressional district is both beautiful and inspiring. It is historic. It is where freedom was born. I know every square foot of it and cherish it, for in it are my roots and life. I know its friendly, charming people, and I love them. I enjoy serving them to the best of my ability in the Congress of the United States. I intend to continue to represent them as long as God wills and as long as they honor me with their selection. Now, as for all of you who are here this evening. I hope your future, every day of it, will be as full of happiness as my evening has been with you on this memorable occasion.

Almost half a century, I said in the beginning of my remarks, is a long time. During this time, I have reached some conclusions about life and living, a few of which I will leave with you. The good people in every country in the world greatly outnumber the bad. Selfishness never blooms but always withers in the bud. Happiness is in proportion to the giving of one's talents for the benefit of others. Right must never be compromised with wrong. The strength of man's mind controls the power of his humanity. I could go on with these observations that I have made over these many years. I shall conclude, however, with just one. When wealth is lost, nothing is lost; when health is lost, much is lost; when friendship is lost, part of one's self is lost; when character is lost, all is lost; when faith is lost, all meaning of life is lost.

During this almost half century of public service, there have been some very high peaks that have extended high above the hills and valleys of my life. One of these high peaks represents the award to me of the distinguished service medal of the American Legion. Another of these high peaks has pushed its way into the sky this evening. This good-government award of the Crosscup-Pishon Post for which I am so deeply grateful, will always be cherished. Thank you again. I bid you all good luck, good evening, and a beautiful tomorrow.

ACCIDENTS AND DEATHS FROM ACCIDENTS OF THE HIGHWAYS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 337, which reads:

Whereas millions of motor vehicle traffic accidents occur in the United States every year; and

Whereas there are millions of persons injured and permanently crippled as a result of these accidents; and

Whereas there are many thousands of persons killed as a result of these accidents; and

Whereas many of these accidents occur over long weekends due to a holiday; and

Whereas many drivers of motor vehicles over these holiday weekends are inexperienced; and

Whereas many of the motor vehicles in operation on the highways over these weekends are mechanically defective; and

Whereas speed is very largely the cause of these accidents; and

Whereas it is the desire of the Congress of the United States to prevent as many motor vehicle accidents as possible over holiday weekends and prevent death and injury on the highways; and

Whereas, it is the desire of Congress to take whatever steps that are possible to limit these accidents: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) it is the sense of the Congress that the speed of all motor vehicles on the highways over holiday weekends, with the exception of emergency vehicles, should be limited to 50 miles an hour, and that no vehicle should be permitted to operate on the highways over such weekend if it has not been inspected and certified to be in safe operating condition.

(b) The President of the United States is requested to notify the Governors of the several States of this resolution, and to request their cooperation in its implementation.

Mr. Speaker, when I was at home over this last week end I was besieged and implored by anxious fathers and mothers that something be done to limit, particularly over holiday weekends, the toll of death and injury by accident to young people of the United States and in fact to those of all ages.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we took some action, whatever action is possible, to stop these unnecessary and most cruel accidents. Do we feel that life is so cheap in the United States that we are not willing to try to protect the youth of our country and to protect older people, to protect those of all ages?

The President recently acted, as did our committees, to prevent some of the terrible accidents by air. That was a long time in coming. Mr. Speaker, I think we should take appropriate action, if possible, to prevent death by accident on the highways. Those accidents run into the millions and millions. The number of deaths is tremendous and they are mounting all the time. Not enough attention is paid to this very horrible situation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like if possible that this come up under unanimous consent, although it has not yet been referred to a committee for action, before the long week end over Memorial Day. I shall beg and try to see if by chance some action can be taken. I would like to remind the House that the 4th of July comes on a Friday. That means a long holiday weekend. I remind the House that Labor Day comes on Monday, and that is going to mean a long weekend. We have coming in the immediate future several long holiday weekends. I am sure every Member, if he puts his mind to it, will help. I trust the President of the United States will issue a very strong plea and take some action, as he did to limit air traffic accidents. The passage of this resolution should help.

That is my wish and my prayer, Mr. Speaker.

THE TOWNSEND PLAN

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill often referred to as the Townsend plan bill—but this bill is a change in the Social Security Act. I now give a brief analysis of the bill.

The Townsend plan bill will amend title II of the Social Security Act providing uniform benefit payments to all eligible beneficiaries financed by a tax on gross income—gross receipts—beginning with 1 percent and progressing to a maximum of 2 percent.

Eligibility for benefits: Primary beneficiaries—persons in the United States who are 60 years of age and over, totally and permanently disabled persons 18 to 60, female heads of families with dependent children under 18, subject to requirements outlined below.

(a) Secondary beneficiaries—children in the United States under 18 dependent upon an adult beneficiary—and children under 18 orphaned or otherwise deprived of parental support.

(b) Any person except a child—secondary—beneficiary must have resided in the United States at least 10 years.

Earnings provisions: Adult beneficiaries—including mothers under 18 with dependent children—may earn up to \$75 per month without reduction in benefits, with benefits reduced \$1 for each full \$2 earned in employment or self-employment over \$75 per month.

(a) Child beneficiaries reduce benefits \$1 for each full \$2 earned over \$50 in any month.

These provisions are designed to encourage beneficiaries to take part in productive life without facing frustrating penalties, but set up sufficient loss of benefits to discourage them from underbidding for jobs. This will aid greatly in the rehabilitation of the disabled; in easing our youth into gainful occupation; and in easing workers into retirement.

Benefits: All primary beneficiaries will be entitled to the same benefit, unless penalized for some violation of the law or unless they voluntarily apply for less than the full benefit. All child beneficiaries will be entitled to one-third of the prevailing primary benefit.

(a) Benefits will vary somewhat from month to month because of changes in prices and economic conditions, all of which will be directly reflected in the revenue from the gross income tax. As living standards advance in general, the benefits of the program will advance accordingly, since the volume of business necessary to such advanced standards will result in increased revenue from the gross income tax. However, this will not mean the beneficiaries need not know how much they are to receive each month—necessary administrative procedure will make known the amount of revenue collected for any given month long before the time of its actual distribution as benefits.

(b) Statistical information on business and population indicates that primary benefits at the present time would average between \$130 and \$140 a month. However, to guard against the possibility that in the early stages of the

program—as has been the case with most new programs—many people would not qualify themselves promptly for benefits, resulting in a relatively few beneficiaries dividing the revenue into unjustifiably high benefits—a limit of \$150 a month is placed on all benefits for the first 24 months of the program. After 2 years, presumably, all possible beneficiaries will be participating. Thereafter, the total number of beneficiaries will vary but very slightly, apart from increasing normally as time goes on. After 24 months, no limit on the size of benefits will exist, and beneficiaries will divide the revenue at a substantially constant rate. As economic expansion continues and general living standards rise, Townsend plan benefits will also rise. Only in the initial phase of the program will a statutory limit on benefits serve any justifiable purpose.

The amount of benefits is designed to add to the income of the aged the amount necessary to enable them, generally, to participate fully in prevailing national standards of living. Despite all social-security programs and efforts so far—public and private—the comparative income-position of the average aged American has been declining since the end of World War II.

Only benefits of the amount provided for in this program can serve the ends of social justice. Only by being variable, as provided for in this program, can benefits be adequate at all times.

Death benefits will be provided by continuing deceased beneficiaries' benefits for 3 months after death.

Financing: A Federal gross income tax of 2 percent on all personal incomes above \$250 monthly and on all company incomes—gross receipts—will be levied. Tax returns will be made monthly and taxes paid monthly.

An account will be established in the United States Treasury to which the revenue will be credited. Administrative costs will be deducted, month by month, and the total balance of each month's collections will be distributed in the form of benefits. Benefits received in any month will have been raised in the sixth month preceding.

Principle administrative and miscellaneous provisions: Beginning with the seventh month after its effective date, the system will be in operation and paying benefits. It took title II of the Social Security Act—old-age and survivors insurance—5 years to pay out its first few benefits.

The gross income tax will start at 1 percent for 6 months, increase one-fourth percent each calendar quarter until it reaches 2 percent—thereby instituting and fully maturing the system within a year and a half of its effective date.

Beneficiaries of present programs of old-age and survivors insurance, Federal disability insurance, and the various public-assistance programs will lose no benefits with the enactment of the Townsend plan. The Townsend bill provides that in cases where, at the start, its benefits might be less than some social-security benefits, the difference will be made up from social-security funds. Then, as the gross income tax increases from the

1 percent starting rate to 2 percent, benefits will increase steadily until all will be receiving more than twice as much as the average payments under the present programs. Thus, a smooth transition from the present system to the Townsend plan, benefiting all and with losses to none, honoring fully all benefit rights under present programs, will take place.

The Townsend bill provides that all money in the old-age and survivors insurance and the Federal disability insurance trust funds are expendable under authorizations by Congress to implement the provisions of the Townsend bill, but for no other purposes.

PANAMA-UNITED STATES RELATIONS: CANAL ZONE RESIDENTS SPEAK

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since addressing the House on March 26 and April 2, 1958, on the subject of sovereignty of the Panama Canal Zone, I have received numerous communications from people in many walks of life in various sections of the Nation. These include many from the Canal Zone, who, as residents there, are well informed as to actual conditions on the isthmus through personal observation and experience.

The unanimous approval of the views expressed by me is solid proof of the importance of those two addresses. Their timeliness is firmly established by the tragic story of the recent trip of the Vice President to South America, culminating in the events at Lima and Caracas, together with recent occurrences in Panama beginning with the flag-raising incident in the Canal Zone and the rioting, with fatal consequences, of students in Panama City and Colon. It is clear that there is communistic influences and leadership behind these student outbreaks.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to stress at this time that these outbreaks in Panama cannot be viewed as purely local affairs. Soviet agents were there just as they are in every country of the Western Hemisphere. They are busily fishing in troubled waters and taking advantage of every condition of unrest to promote demonstrations of violence, with the special purpose of creating intense animosity against the United States and the impairment of our international relationships. All this is being done to divert our attention from the Near East.

In order that the Congress and the executive department may have a cross-section of the views of residents in the Canal Zone, I quote a letter from one of its civic councils as follows:

MAY 9, 1958.
HONORABLE SIR: I represent the * * * civic council, a group elected by the people of * * *, Canal Zone, towns of United States rate Panama Canal Company employees.

At our April meeting, it was moved and unanimously carried that this body sincerely commend you for the courageous, enlightened and timely stand you have taken in regard to the exercise of powers "as if it were sovereign" of our Government over the Canal Zone.

We who work in the Canal Zone, and live more closely with the situation, are most heartily in accord with your March 26 speech in the House of Representatives. Knowing the reaction of the radical element of Panama, we are not surprised at the many charges, countercharges and false statements that have been forthcoming since your speech was published locally. We do, however, desire to make known to you the reaction of your fellow United States citizens, residents of the Canal Zone. To that end, we have questioned many of our coworkers in the various trades and professional groups to enable us to report to you an adequate cross section of their views.

We have found not one United States citizen who disagree with you. The following are a few quotations:

A housewife: "That man should be encouraged. You men should write to tell him so."

A naval officer: "There should be more Congressmen like him."

A machinist: "He did not go far enough."

An engineer: "That part about the State Department giveaway and appeasement policies is too true."

A stenographer: "I hope he keeps on talking until something is done about it."

A draftsman: "We certainly know he has the facts and knows the true story. More power to him."

A Navy civilian employee: "It's time something like this was said. I only hope something comes of it."

A mechanic: "That man should come here and talk with us individually. We can give him much more information."

An engineer: "I wonder how far the State Department did go with Panama and what they have promised under their own interpretation of the treaty. Congressman FLOOD should keep on until the whole thing is cleared up."

A customs department employee: "Someone had better stop it before it goes too far. FLOOD has made a good start."

The above are typical quotations by intelligent and interested people of the Canal Zone who are sincerely pleased that you have informed yourself so thoroughly and have so ably set forth the situation in clear and understandable terms.

We hope that this letter will afford the encouragement you have earned and the inspiration for you to continue the good work you have started.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. VINSON (at the request of Mr. PRESTON), for today and the remainder of the week, on account of death in the family.

To Mr. CRETILLA, for June 2 and June 3, on account of official business at Newington, N. H.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. KILDAY, for 60 minutes, on June 2.

Mr. MOULDER, for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS, for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today, and for 10 minutes on tomorrow.

Mr. BRAY, for 30 minutes, on June 4.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. RIVERS.

Mr. ULLMAN (at the request of Mr. BOLLING) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS (at the request of Mr. BOLLING) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. BOLLING).

Mr. CELLER (at the request of Mr. BOLLING).

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. MINSHALL.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following title, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7870. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1955, to authorize an additional \$10,000,000 for the completion of the Inter-American Highway;

H. R. 10746. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12356. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1954; and

H. R. 12377. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital improvement programs and to amend provisions of law relating to Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2498. An act for the relief of Matthew M. Epstein; and

S. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the International Civil Aviation Organization to hold the 12th session of its assembly in the United States in 1959.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 8490. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to rice acreage allotments; and

H. J. Res. 378. An act to authorize the President to proclaim annually the week which includes July 4 as "National Safe Boating Week."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday, May 28, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1963. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting plans for works of improvement for the Wild Rice Creek watershed, North Dakota and South Dakota, and the Canoe Creek watershed, Kentucky, pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1964. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the agricultural experiment stations, 1957, which covers the receipts, expenditures, and work of the agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, pursuant to section 7 of the Hatch Act, as amended, approved August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 671); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1965. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the annual report of tort claims paid by the Department of State for the calendar year 1957, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 578. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 12591, a bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1777). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. S. 2533. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to lease space for Federal agencies for periods not exceeding 15 years, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1814). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11477. A bill to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1815). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 579. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 12541, a bill to promote the national defense by providing for reorganization of the Department of Defense,

and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1816). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2060. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Biro; with amendment (Rept. No. 1778). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2064. An act for the relief of Marie Ethel Pavlovitch and her daughter, Dolly Hester Pavlovitch; without amendment (Rept. No. 1779). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2087. An act for the relief of Eva Lichtfuss; without amendment (Rept. No. 1780). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2099. An act for the relief of Irene B. Moss; without amendment (Rept. No. 1781). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2147. An act for the relief of Chong Sook Rhee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1782). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2168. An act for the relief of Armas Edwin Jansson-Viik; with amendment (Rept. No. 1783). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2196. An act for the relief of Annadore E. D. Haubold and Cynthia Edna Haubold; without amendment (Rept. No. 1784). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2239. An act for the relief of Wadhwa Salime Hamade; with amendment (Rept. No. 1785). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2245. An act for the relief of Moy Tong Poy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1786). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2251. An act for the relief of Manley Francis Burton; with amendment (Rept. No. 1787). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2256. An act for the relief of Luz Poblete and Robert Poblete Broaddus, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1788). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2301. An act for the relief of Genevieve M. Scott Bell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1789). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2346. An act for the relief of Lucy Hedwig Schultz; without amendment (Rept. No. 1790). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2493. An act for the relief of Maria G. Aslanis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1791). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2499. An act for the relief of Iona Agnes Ronay; without amendment (Rept. No. 1792). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2503. An act for the relief of Maria

H. Aguas and Buena M. Castro; without amendment (Rept. No. 1793). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2638. An act for the relief of Florica Bogdan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1794). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2613. An act for the relief of Cedomilj Mihallo Ristic; without amendment (Rept. No. 1795). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2621. An act for the relief of Olive V. Rabiniaux; without amendment (Rept. No. 1796). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2650. An act for the relief of Tokiyo Nakajima and her child, Megumi (Kathy) Nakajima; without amendment (Rept. No. 1797). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2657. An act for the relief of Jesus Romeo Sotelo-Lopez; without amendment (Rept. No. 1798). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2713. An act for the relief of Abbas Mohammad Awad; without amendment (Rept. No. 1799). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2718. An act for the relief of Haseep Milhem Esper; without amendment (Rept. No. 1800). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2819. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hermine Melamed; with amendment (Rept. No. 1801). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2849. An act for the relief of Moo Wah Jung; without amendment (Rept. No. 1802). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3124. An act for the relief of Tommy Ilton Chatterton (Tommy Kim); without amendment (Rept. No. 1803). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1691. A bill for the relief of Margherita Conca; without amendment (Rept. No. 1804). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILLINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2759. A bill for the relief of Josephine Shelby; with amendment (Rept. No. 1805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4330. A bill for the relief of Lucia (Castaneda) Sayaan, Gloria (Castaneda) Sayaan, Erlinda (Castaneda) Sayaan, and Pascual (Castaneda) Sayaan; with amendment (Rept. No. 1806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7330. A bill for the relief of Demetrius Daskalakis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1807). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7725. A bill for the relief of Shizuko Sese Sheveland; without amendment (Rept. No. 1808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 321. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 595. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

with amendment (Rept. No. 1810). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 609. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1811). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 610. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1812). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 611. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1813). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1248. An act for the relief of Fred G. Clark; without amendment (Rept. No. 1817). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2940. An act for the relief of Joseph H. Choy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1818). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 12694. A bill to authorize loans for the construction of hospitals and other facilities under title VI of the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 12695. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED:

H. R. 12696. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 12697. A bill to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class parcel post; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 12698. A bill to adjust the compensation of certain postal field service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 12699. A bill to make equity capital and long-term credit more readily available for small-business concerns; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 12700. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 12701. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit retirement by all persons in the United States at the age of 60 years with benefits that will assure full participation by elderly persons generally in prevailing national standards of living, to provide like benefits for disabled persons, and to provide benefits for certain female heads of families and for certain children; to provide for the establishment and operation of this system of social security by an equitable gross income tax; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 12702. A bill to amend section 17 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to authorize

rehearing of certain claims; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H. R. 12703. A bill to extend for 2 years the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 12704. A bill to amend the provisions of law codified as section 500, title 16, United States Code; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 12705. A bill directing the Administrator of General Services to withhold further action relating to the disposal of certain land in the city of Roseburg, Ore.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 12706. A bill to liberalize the tariff laws for works of art and other exhibition material, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 12707. A bill to add certain public lands in California to the Pala Indian Reservation, the Pauma Indian Reservation, and the Cleveland National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 12708. A bill to amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, to provide that it shall apply to fresh flowers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 12709. A bill to encourage equity investment in new and small business, to relieve unemployment and provide additional revenue to the Federal Government to be applied to debt reduction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 12710. A bill to provide for research into problems of flight within and outside the earth's atmosphere, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 12711. A bill to provide a 5-year program of assistance to enable depressed segments of the fishing industry in the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. J. Res. 615. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee To Investigate the Gold Mining Industry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. Res. 580. Resolution to amend the rules of the House to provide for a Committee on Science and Astronautics; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 12712. A bill for the relief of the Kroger Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. R. 12713. A bill for the relief of Rachel T. Carbonaro, Vivian T. Carbonaro, and Juliet M. Carbonaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 12714. A bill for the relief of Lazar Petrovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 12715. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ana P. Cowan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.